CONFIDENTIAL

Government of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

(Irrigation)

G.O. No. 2443, 17th November 1938

Irrigation—Projects—Coimbatore—Kollegal taluk—Hebbahalla Scheme—Sanctioned.

CONFIDENTIAL

Government of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 2443, 17th November 1938

Irrigation—Projects—Coimbatore—Kollegal taluk—Hebbahalla Scheme—Sanctioned.

READ—the following papers:—

G.O. No. 559 I., dated 19th February 1929.

Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

II

rsement No. 891/37 D-22, dated 22nd October 193

NOTE ON PART II SCHEMES, 1938-39.

Head of account	..	18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues—Accounts not kept.
Item of expenditure	..	Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla-Kollegal taluk—Coimbatore district.
Estimated cost	..	Rs. 12,500.
Programme, 1938-39	..	Rs. 12,500.

In April 1936, the Collector of Coimbatore reported that irrigation sources in th Kollegal taluk suffered badly in recent years due to failure of seasonal rains resulting i heavy remissions. He suggested that the proposal abandoned in G O. No. 559 I., date 19th February 1929, should be reconsidered and worked out in two parts: (1) the channe part requiring unskilled labour under Special Accelerated programme, and (2) the anicu and sluice part, requiring skilled labour as a contribution work. In approving these pro posals in Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936, the Board of Revenu also decided that in view of the remoteness and unhealthiness of the tract, and of th general poverty of the ryots concerned no contribution need be demanded from the ryot for the proposed anicut.

After some correspondence an estimate for Rs. 15,000 for excavating a supply channel was sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer under the Accelerated Programme

An estimate for an anicut and a sluice for Rs. 12,500 for works (and Rs. 16,28 including establishment and other charges) has now been received from the Superintend ng Engineer.

Hebbahalla is a jungle stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam Reserv forests of the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district. After a short course in British limits t runs through Mysore territory for about three miles before joining Hone-Hole whic falls into the Cauvery. The proposed anicut across Hebbahalla will divert a portion o the river flow into the following existing tanks:—

(1) Kottakarai, (2) Hondrabalu, (3) Doddaranganatham, (4) Chikkaranganatham (5) Konganakarai, (6) Mudikondam.

This proposal aims at improving the supplies to the existing ayacut under the tank and no extension of ayacut is proposed.

As the stream runs partly in Madras and partly in Mysore, the implications of the agreements with Mysore were examined and Government have decided that the work may be taken up—vide this office Letter No. 1808/36 B-14, dated 7th June 1937, and Govern nent Demi-official No. 1743 D/37-3, dated 28th August 1937.

Financial aspect.—The average annual remission under the tanks benefited by the scheme has been as essed by the Collector at Rs. 1,559. The anicut scheme will return about 12·5 per cent on the outlay of Rs. 12,500 or 9·45 per cent or Rs. 16,286 inclusive of percentage charges.

Submitted to Government. The estimate for the anicut and headsluice is under scrutiny and will be submitted to Government by about the 25th instant. The work is very urgent as without the anicut, the channel (being excavated under the accelerated programme) will not function effectively. The scheme may be included in the Part II Schemes for 1938-39.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

III

Letter from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 25th October 1937, No. 1808/36-B-20.

I forward for approval of Government an estimate for Rs. 12,500 (for works) for constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla. My Letter No. 1808/36-B-14, dated 7th June 1937, * to Government and Board's Endorsements H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936 and No. 2612/36, dated 26th October 1936 (copies enclosed), explain the necessity for the work. The estimate report gives details of the proposed work.

2. The work has been proposed for inclusion in Part II Schemes—vide my Endt. No. 891/37-D-22, dated 22nd October 1937.

ENCLOSURES

(1)

Report to accompany the estimate for constructing an anicut with headsluice across the Hebbahalla River, Kollegal Taluk.

[Estimate Rs. 12,500. Plans S. Nos. 4 and 14/37 and 207/37.]

This estimate is prepared in accordance with the instructions contained in the endorsements Nos. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936 and No. 2612/36, dated 26th October 1936, of the Board of Revenue wherein the Board has approved of an expenditure of Rs. 14,500 for excavation of a supply channel from the Hebbahalla to the Kottakarai tank and Rs. 12,550 for constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla. The estimate for the supply channel with its auxiliary works has been separately sanctioned for Rs. 15,000 in C.R. No. 1 S.W.-193/38 and is being carried out under the Scheme of Accelerated Programme of Works.

2. The proposal to construct an anicut across the Hebbahalla and take a channel from it is to augment the supplies to a system of tanks in the locality and avoid frequent remissions in the areas irrigated by them. The tanks benefited are (1) Kottakarai, (2) Hondrabalu, (3) Doddaranganatham, (4) Chickaranganatham, (5) Kongankarai and (6) Mudikondan.

3. The proposed anicut is to be situated about 2½ miles from the Kottakarai tank near R.F. stone No. 60 where the halla comes out of the steep hills and reserve forests. The halla drains 11·9 square miles of hilly slopes clad with forests.

4. The anicut will be built at the site shown in the plans. The bed and the banks are rocky and afford good foundation for the anicut. The anicut will be of random rubble in cement mortar (1 : 5) pointed in cement (1 : 3). It will be 101′ long and 10·6′ high at the deepest point with a base width of 7′ 3″ and top width of 5′ 0″. The top 1′ 0″ will have a coping of concrete broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 3. The anicut is designed to discharge a flood of 2,781 cusecs with a bead of 4·08′.

5. The foundations of the anicut on soft rock will be 4′ 0″ cement concrete (broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 4) for a length of 22′ from the left end and the remaining portion will be built on hard rock benched and dressed.

6. The anicut will be protected by an upstream apron 22′ long and 50′ wide at the left end (where the sub-soil is soft rock) consisting of 2′ 0″ puddle clay and 1′ 6″ dry stone packing on top. The top level of the apron will be + 116·50. On the downstream side there will be an impervious apron for a width of 46′ consisting of 1′ 6″ cement concrete 1 : 4 and roughstone in cement mortar on top 1′ 6″ thick. A second apron 24′ 0″ wide will be provided consisting of ordinary roughstones 1′ 6″ thick.

---

* Printed on pages 1-3 of Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

7. There will be a scouring sluice in the anicut at its right end with a ventway 4′ 6″ wide by 5′ 0″ high, with its sill at R.L. + 119·50 operated by a screw shutter. There will be a breast wall over a cutstone lintel to limit the size of the vent. The side walls of the scouring sluice will be 3′ 0″ thick. As the sill of the scouring sluice is 2·5′ lower than the sill of the head sluice, it is expected that the channel in front of the headsluice can be kept clear of silt by periodically working the scouring sluice.

8. The headsluice will consist of 2 vents each 4′ 6″ wide by 3′ 6″ high with a pier 2′ 3″ thick. The sill of the sluice will be 2·5′ above that of the scouring sluice, i.e., at R.L. + 122·00. The sluice is designed to discharge 200 cusecs for 2½ days during floods sufficient to fill up the Kotakarai and Hondrabalu tanks, and half of Doddaranganatham, Chickaranganatham, Kongankarai and Mudigundan tanks. The level of the sluice platform will be at + 132·50, i.e., 2·82′ above + 129·68, the M.F.L. above the anicut. The sluice will be worked by screw shutters from a cutstone platform and the anicut crest will be reached by a flight of steps.

9. On the right bank, there will be an abutment connecting to hard rock there. On the left bank, the body wall of the anicut will be carried to the outcorp of rock and abutment and wings will be omitted. A lump sum provision for revetment has been made to revet the left bank above and below the anicut where necessary.

10. As the channel downstream of the head sluice will run alongside the halla for the first 200′ a masonry wall is necessary on the left side of the channel. A wall will be built with its top at + 127·25, i.e., 0·5′ above the observed M.F.L. + 126·75 of the river at the site. Provision for the wall has been made in the estimate for excavating the supply channel. The bose between the halla and the channel will be revetted.

11. The estimate also contains provision for the following

Ring bund and baling.

Temporary road to anicut site for inspection, et

Temporary shed for materials.

Acquisition of land (1 acre).

12. The supply channel costs Rs. 15,000 and the anicut Rs. 12,500. The average annual emission on lands irrigated by the tanks which the scheme will benefit works to Rs. 1,559—vide Collector's report No. 12860/35-A-2, dated 12th October 1936.

A. R. VENKATACHARI,
Deputy Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

(2)

Endorsement of the Board of Revenue, H. No. 907/36, *dated 7th September* 1936.

Read—the following

1. G.O. No. 559 I., dated 19th February 1929.
2. Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, Ref. No. 12860/35, dated 17th April 1936.
3. Letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, No. 1808–36-B-2, dated 1st September 1936.

The proposal is to divert the Hebbahalla stream water into the catchment of the Kottakarai tank of Kollegal taluk, by excavating a supply channel from the stream and by constructing an anicut across it. The cost of the former involving mainly unskilled labour is reported to be Rs. 14,500 and that of the latter Rs. 12,550. These works will augment the supplies to a system of tanks in the locality and the tanks to be benefited are Kottakarai, Hondrabalu, Doddaranganatham, Chikkaranganatham and Kongalkarai. As the Mudukondam tank lies alongside Kongalkarai and is connected with it, it will also be equally benefited by the scheme.

Besides these tanks, the Hampapuram tank and the Pappankarai channel from the Gondal river, are also likely to be benefited by the scheme. But as they are at the tail-end of the system of tanks and have to depend on the surplus of the upper tanks, the Board does not propose to take their ayacuts into consideration for purposes of examining the financial aspects of the scheme.

2. The Collector and the Executive Engineer consider that although there will be no extensions of irrigation, the existing ayacuts now suffering from deficiency of supplies will be immensely benefited and that remissions which are now being granted, will be saved to the Government. The earlier reports of the Executive Engineer of 1927 and 1931 and the present reports do not

show clearly whether there will be enough supplies in the river in October and November for diversion into the tanks. But the report of the Executive Engineer dated 6th July 1936 written after inspection on 28th June 1936 clearly indicates that the rains at the end of May could have been usefully diverted into the tanks if there had been a supply channel and that such an additional supply would enable the starting of early cultivation by the ryots and obviate the need for supplies in the latter part of the irrigation season in October-November. The Board therefore considers that the scheme would save the remissions which are now being granted under the system of tanks. The following table * compiled from the irrigation accounts of the villages concerned, shows the amounts of the remissions granted during the last ten years. The average annual remission which will be saved by the scheme is Rs. 1,821 or Rs. 1,800 in round figures.

3. The Board accepts the Chief Engineer's proposal to include the excavation of the supply channel in the special accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor irrigation works, as it will provide work for the rural population and as it will, at the same time, make the tanks more efficient sources of irrigation. The Chief Engineer is accordingly requested to provide funds in the current and the next official years and to arrange for the starting and completion of the work as expeditiously as possible.

4. Without an anicut across the Hebbahalla stream, the supply channel to be excavated under the special accelerated and widespread programme would not be of much use. The construction of the anicut is an entirely new work in respect of which the sanction of the Government seems necessary. Even if the cost of the supply channel (which being financed from the grant for the special and accelerated programme may not yield any return) is added to the cost of the anicut, the saving on remissions will amount to a return of 6¾ per cent on the estimated total cost. In view of the remoteness and unhealthiness of the tract and of the general poverty of the ryots concerned, the Board does not propose to demand any contribution from the ryots. The Chief Engineer is therefore requested to take early steps for the sanction and execution of the scheme.

5. The Collector of Coimbatore is requested to have the figures in paragraph 2 above verified at an early date and to report whether the Board's estimate of the average savings in remission of Rs. 1,800 per annum, is correct and may be assumed for purposes of the revenue forecast.

D. I. R. MUIR,
Joint Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
,, Collector of Coimbatore.

(3)

Endorsement of the Board of Revenue, H. No. 2612/36, *dated 26th October* 1936.

Read—the following

1. Board's Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936.
2. Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 12th October 1936, Ref. No. 12360/35-A-2.

In its endorsement read above, the Board requested the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to take early steps for the sanction and execution of the Hebbahalla diversion scheme consisting of (1) excavation of the supply channel at a cost of Rs. 14,500 under the special accelerated and widespread programme and (2) the construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla at a cost of Rs. 12,550. From the figures compiled from the irrigation accounts of the villages concerned which were available in the Board's office, it was found that the average annual remissions granted was Rs. 1,800 and that the savings in remissions would give a return of 6¾ per cent on the estimated total cost of both the items of work. It was also thought that the ayacuts of part of the Pappangarai channel and of the Doddaranganatham channel would be benefited from the augmented supplies in the Doddaranganatham tank, as they lie adjacent to the tank ayacut and below it. The Collector now reports that the ayacuts of these channels will not be benefited. According to the average remission figures furnished by the Collector the return on the scheme on the whole will be 5·76 per cent, i.e., 0·24 per cent less than the 6 per cent necessary to satisfy the criterion of productivity. But this is 0·76 per cent higher than the return prescribed for protective works in the taluk in G.O. No. 433–I, dated 21st February 1933. The Board considers that even on the basis of the expected return of 5·76 per cent the scheme may be proceeded with.

D. I. R. MUIR,
Joint Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Collector of Coimbatore.

* Not received in the Secretariat.

(4)

Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 12th October 1936, Ref. No. 12860/35-A-2.

[*Reference.*—Board's Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936.]

The Tahsildar of Kollegal reports that the average annual remission under the several irrigation works affected by the Hebbahalla Project comes to Rs. 1,559 only as against Rs. 1,821 worked out in the Board's office. A statement * showing the remission granted under each source during the last ten faslis with an explanatory memorandum for the difference between these and Board's figures is enclosed :—

(5)

Estimate—Abstract.

Constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla river with a headsluice.

Item number.	Quantity.	Description of work.	Rate.	Per	Amount.
					RS.
1	35,000 c.ft.	Earthwork excavation in red earth gravel, etc., with 2 extra leads and 2 extra lifts M.D.S.S. 20 B.	7	1,000 c.ft.	245
2	31,000 c.ft.	Excavation in soft disintegrated rock with two extra leads and two extra lifts.	12	,,	372
3	16,000 c.ft.	Blasting rock	10	100 c.ft.	1,600
4	L.S.	Benching and dressing blasted surface	L.S.	..	150
5	2,800 c.ft.	Concrete broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 4	42/4	100 c.ft.	1,183
6	530 c.ft.	Concrete broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 3	51	,,	270
7	9,800 c.ft.	Roughstone in cement mortar 1 : 5	42/8	,,	4,165
8	5,300	Pointing with cement mortar 1 : 3	4/14	100 c.ft.	258
9	125 c.ft.	Cutstone in cement mortar	168/3	100 c.ft.	210
10	L.S.	Roughstone revetment in left bank and for protecting nose, cushion wall for apron, etc.	..	L.S.	758
11	2,200 c.ft.	Puddle clay	7/2	100 c.ft.	157
12	2,500 c.ft.	Roughstone apron	16/14	,,	422
13	L.S.	Teakwood shutters for scouring sluice and headsluice with screw gearing arrangements, etc., completed.	L.S.	..	1,000
14	L.S.	Forming ring bund and baling water (if necessary)	L.S.	..	100
15	L.S.	Forming temporary road	L.S.	..	300
16	L.S.	Temporary shed for materials	L.S.	..	400
17	..	One acre land acquisition	..	..	50
18	..	Supervision charges } at 5 per cent	..	..	584
		Contingencies }			
19	..	Unforeseen works, to meet extra cost of land compensation and extra cost of shutters if any required during execution.	..	..	284
		Grand total of estimate ..			12,500

The actual cost of the shutters will be ascertained from Public Works Workshops before starting the work.

IV

Telephonic message from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort Saint George, the 14th December 1937.

[Part II Schemes—Order of urgency.]

Orders are being taken whether Mysore should be addressed in reference to the Hebbahalla scheme, and it is proposed to hold up its consideration as a Part II Scheme pending a reply from that Government. If, for some reason, the Part II Scheme does not materialise, the work on the excavation of the supply channel will probably be a waste to a large extent. Please say whether, in the circumstances, it will not be preferable to hold up work on the supply channel for the present.

V

Telephonic message from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 17th December 1937, No. 1808/36-B-24.

[*Reference.*—Your Telephonic message dated 14th December 1937.]

It is most unlikely that Mysore will object to the anicut. Even if they do, the channe without the anicut will ensure some extra supply to the tanks. Besides, the cost of the channe is being debited to the accelerated scheme which was intended to provide relief for unemployment and not for productive schemes. I therefore think it would be a mistake to stop work on the channel. I do not propose to take any action to postpone the channel work without a specia order from Government.

VI

Letter from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated the 26th March 1938, No. 1808/36-B-30.

I invite reference to the correspondence ending with my No. 1808/36-B-25,* dated 19th January 1938, and request you kindly to let me know if a reply from Mysore has been received.

I have asked the Superintending Engineer to proceed with the preliminaries connected with the construction of the anicut and headsluice without committing Government to any expenditure.

VII

Letter from K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of Madras, to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, dated Fort St. George, the 25th August 1938, No. 3525-D/37-4.

I am directed to invite attention to my letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938, and to ask whether the subject of that letter was intimated to the Government of Mysore.

VIII

Letter from the Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, the 6th September 1938, R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O. I.

With reference to your letter No. 3525-D/37-4, dated the 25th August 1938, I am directed to say that the contents of your letter No. 652-P. W. (I.), dated 29th March 1938, were intimated to the Government of Mysore on 20th April 1938 with an enquiry whether they had any objection to the works referred to being proceeded with. They were reminded on 4th June 1938, 12th July 1938 and 20th August 1938 but have not yet replied. A further communication will be addressed to you on receipt of their reply.

IX

Telephonic message from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 14th September 1938.

[*Reference.*—Hebbahalla Scheme—Your Demi-official No. 1808/36-B-32, dated 11th April 1938.]

Will you kindly ascertain and report urgently whether work on the supply channel taken up under the special programme has been completed or is nearing completion, and also the latest date by which it is necessary to commence work on the anicut and headsluice ?

X

Endorsement No. 1808/36-B-37, dated 26th September 1938.

[From the Executive Engineer, Salem division, Salem, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, No. 1657, S.E., dated 18th September 1938. *Reference.*—Your Memorandum No. 1808/36-B-36, dated 15th September 1938.]

The work on the supply channel is nearing completion. In this year's budget, a sum of Rs. 12,500 was allotted for the execution of the anicut work. When sending the alterations to this year's budget at the end of August, I have proposed to reduce the grant for this year to Rs. 2,500 as the plans and estimate for the work have not yet been sanctioned. Even if the plans and estimate were sanctioned now, it would not be possible for me to call for tenders and complete the work and spend the full grant of Rs. 12,500 during the current year. As this is the rainy season, there is likely to be water in the Hebbahalla until the end of November. Consequently, if the plans and estimates are sanctioned, I now propose to start the work in December and give it a good start during the current year and for this, a reduced grant of Rs. 2,500 has been asked. If this is done, the work could be completed by the end of June or July next, and the anicut would be ready for the next season.

---

* Printed on page 6 of Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

As it will take about two months to call for tenders and complete agreements, I think that it will be necessary that the plans and estimate should be sanctioned before the end of October and that the work should be started by the middle of December, if we are to spend the revised grant of Rs. 2,500 asked for during the current year and complete the anicut and have it ready for use by the end of June next.

Copy submitted to Government with reference to the telephonic message, dated 14th September 1938.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

XI

Letter from the Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident of Mysore, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, the 28th September 1938, R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O.I.

[Your letter No. 652-P.W. (I.), dated the 29th March 1938.]

In continuation of my letter R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O I., dated the 6th September 1938, I am directed to forward a copy of letter from the Government of Mysore No. 510/K.S.S. 1325, dated the 16th September 1938, and to request that this Residency may kindly be informed of the views of the Government of Madras in the matter. I am also to request that if there is no objection, the list of irrigation works asked for by the Government of Mysore in paragraph 3 of their letter may kindly be sent to this Residency.

ENCLOSURE

Letter from the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Public Works Department, Krishnarajasagara Works, Bangalore, dated the 16th September 1938, No. 510/K.S.S. 1325.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O.I., dated the 20th April 1938, addressed to the Secretary to Government of Mysore, Public Works Department, forwarding a copy of letter No. 652-P.W. (I.), dated the 29th March 1938, from the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, and enquiring whether the Mysore Government have any objection to the construction of the above anicut.

2. I am to state that under the Agreement of 1924 between the Madras and Mysore Government, a minimum flow of 900 cusecs has to be ensured to Madras at the Sivasamudram anicut from the 28th January to 27th May. During this period, the Hebbahalla along with other streams, contributes its share of water as the Suvarnavathi river (to which Hebbahalla is a feeder) joins the river Cauvery above the Sivasamudram anicut. The construction of the above anicut with feeder channel will naturally divert the whole flow or a large portion of it and the deficit caused by such diversion of flow requires to be made good by extra issue from the Krishnarajasagar reservoir to keep up the 900 cusecs at Sivasamudram. If the Madras Government agree to pass down the anicut now proposed to be constructed the natural flow in the Hebbahalla during the said period, i.e., from 28th January to 27th May (both days inclusive) and if sufficient checks to verify the natural flow at the anicut are provided, the Mysore Government will have no objection to the work being proceeded with. I request you will be so good as to bring the above facts to the notice of the Madras Government, and request them to keep the work under suspense till a final understanding is arrived at.

3. In this connection, I am also to request you kindly to address the Madras Government with a view to safeguard the interest of Mysore, to furnish the Mysore Government with a list of irrigation works, if any, constructed after the Agreement of 1924 on any of the affluents of the river Cauvery or its tributaries above the Sivasamudram anicut in the Madras Presidency.

XII

Endorsement No. 3525-D/37-5, dated 30th September 1938.

[Hebbahalla Scheme—Letter from the Secretary to the Hon'ble to Resident in Mysore, R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O.I., dated the 28th September 1938.]

Referred to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for very early remarks.

K. RAMUNNI MENON,
Secretary to Government.

XIII

Endorsement No. 1058/38-D-16, dated 28th September 1938.

NOTE ON PART II SCHEMES—1939-40.

Head of account.—'18' Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues—*a.* Works.

Item of expenditure.—Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla-Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.

Estimated cost.—Rs. 12,500.

Programme, 1939-40.—Rs. 12,500.

[Summary same as on pages 1-2 ante.]

Submitted to Government. Government provided Rs. 12,500 for the work in the current year's budget (Budget Estimate, 1938-39), as a Part II Scheme, under 18—Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure—*a.* Works Major. Plans and estimate for the work sent for approval in my No. 1808/36-B-20, dated the 25th October 1937, are now with Government. Please see my Endorsement No. 1808/36-B-37, dated the 26th September 1938, about anticipated expenditure on the work in the current year. If Government are unable to authorise the starting of the work sufficiently early, it may not be possible to commit Government to expenditure in the current year—vide paragraph 56 of the Budget Manual, Second Edition, and the work will have to be considered again as Part II Scheme for 1939-40. As this position may occur when it is too late to propose the work as a Part II Scheme for 1939-40, the proposal is now put up as Part II Scheme for 1939-40 for consideration if Government anticipate any delay in sanctioning the scheme.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

XIV

Letter from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to the Government, Public Works Department, dated the 15th October 1938, No. 1808/36-B-38.

The Mysore Government say that they have no objection to the Hebbahalla Scheme being proceeded with by this Government if (*a*) the whole natural flow in the Hebbahalla is passed down during the hot weather 28th January to 27th May and (*b*) sufficient checks are afforded to Mysore to verify the natural flow at the proposed anicut site.

Item (*a*).—The Hebbahalla was gauged during the hot weather in 1938 and I note in the margin, the actual flow during that period. It will be seen that there is practically no flow worth mentioning. Secondly, the ryots have agreed to continue to grow the usual dry broadcasted variety of paddy now grown—please see copies of the letters from the paddy specialist and the Superintending Engineer. Hence we may agree to pass the whole natural flow during the hot weather period.

Month.	Gauged discharge in m.c. ft.
February 1938	Nil.
March	Nil.
April	Nil.
May	2·625

I wish however to observe that the condition proposed by Mysore is apparently due to an inadequate appreciation of the position. Firstly, the Hebbahalla anicut is 13 miles upstream of the infall of the Swaranavathi into the Cauvery. Hence any small spring flow in summer at the proposed anicut site will be fully absorbed in charging the dry bed of the river and no water will ever reach the Cauvery. No extra issue from Krishnarajasagara will therefore be necessary. Secondly, to save Mysore this extra issue, Madras may say that she agrees to the deduction of this extra quantity from the 900 cusecs due to her at Sivasamudram during the hot weather. By doing so, Madras will not incur any real loss. For example, against 900 cusecs due to Madras, Mysore are now passing 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs in the interest of their own power supply. Assuming that the Hebbahalla anicut diverts 10 cusecs, the quantity due to Madras will be 900—10 or 890 cusecs, but still Mysore must pass the same 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs for her power requirements. Thus by agreeing to deduct the quantity diverted at the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to Madras, Madras will not only not lose any water, but will be able to raise if she wishes a small second crop or at least to grow seed beds to start irrigation in time instead of waiting for the first freshes in June to raise seed beds.

K

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

(Irrigation.)

No. 2444.

From

K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

THE HON'BLE THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

Dated Fort St. George, the 17th November 1938.

Sir,

[Irrigation—Coimbatore District—Kollegal Taluk—Hebbahalla Scheme—Your Letter No. R. Dis. F. 330-38/R.O.I., dated 28th September 1938.]

I am directed to say that without accepting any claims or principle for other cases this Government agree to pass down the anicut proposed to be constructed the natural flow in the Hebbahalla during the period 28th January to 27th May (both days inclusive), and to provide sufficient checks to verify the natural flow at the anicut as desired in paragraph 2 of Mysore Government's letter, No. 510/K.S.S. 1325, dated 16th September 1938. It is presumed that a year's joint gaugings and a daily water card will suffice to provide the checks referred to.

2. As regards paragraph 3 of the Mysore Government's letter, I am to say that no works have been constructed by this Government on any of the affluents of the river Cauvery or its tributaries above the Sivasamudram anicut after the Agreement of 1924, and to request that information in regard to similar works constructed by the Mysore Government may kindly be furnished.

3. I am to add that, in view of what has been stated in paragraph 1 above, this Government are proceeding with the work on the Hebbahalla Scheme.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. RAMUNNI MENON,
Secretary to Government.

CONFIDENTIAL

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 2443. DATED 17TH NOVEMBER 1938.

[SUBJECT.—*Irrigation—Coimbatore—Kollegal taluk—Hebbahalla stream—Construction of anicut.*]

PART II SCHEME, 1938-39.

From the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) No. 891/37-*D*-22, *dated 22nd October* 1937.

From the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) No. 1808/36-*B*-20, *dated 25th October* 1937.

Please see the Chief Engineer's note on pages 1-2 and the Board's endorsements on pages 3-4, current file, which explain the proposals fully. The revenue aspect has been examined by the Board and it has worked out that the combined scheme of the anicut and the supply channel—the latter is being separately excavated under the accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor irrigation works—will pay a return of 5·76 per cent, while the anicut scheme alone will pay a return of 12·5 per cent (according to the Chief Engineer). As the return for productive works has been reduced to 4 per cent with effect from 1st April 1937, even the combined scheme is productive. The proposals may, in the circumstances, be accepted with the concurrence of Revenue and Finance.

K

2. The Chief Engineer and the Board say that the supply channel will not be of much use without the anicut. It does not however seem to follow that merely because of this fact, the whole scheme should be treated as one for purposes of sanction—vide paragraph 409 of the Public Works Department Code. In any case, as the supply channel work is already in progress and as the estimate has been charged to a different head " 68. Irrigation ", the matter need not be reopened

D.V.K.—27-10-37. M.S.K.—27-10-37.

Finance may see for remarks.

P. MADHAVA MENON—27-10-37.

The proposal may be accepted.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—28-10-37.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

This department may agree with the Public Works Secretary. The file may be passed on to Finance.

M.V.M.—28-10-37.

T. M. S. MANI—28-10-37.

B. G. HOLDSWORTH—28-10-37.

FINANCE (B.E. II) DEPARTMENT.

PART II SCHEME, 1938-39.

Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.

Head of account.	Ultimate cost, non-recurring.	Cost in 1938-39 non-recurring.
	RS.	RS.
18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues.	12,500	12,500

The scope of the proposed work and the necessity for the same are explained in the Chief Engineer's note on page 1, current file. This work together with the supply channel under execution will obviate remissions. The expected return thereby is 5·76 per cent.

Submitted that this department may agree to the proposal being considered as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39.

2. This department may also agree with Public Works Department that this work and the supply channel need not be treated as forming part of one scheme, though for purposes of the return expected, the two have to be considered as one scheme as it is stated that without the proposed anicut the supply channel under execution will not function effectively.

C. A. SUNDARAM AYYAR—10-11-37.

C. E. JONES—10-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

A draft note on the Part II Scheme is submitted. It may be sent to Finance for acceptance before circulation to the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) and the Hon'ble the Prime Minister.

2. The Chief Engineer (Irrigation) has separately suggested that the consent of the Mysore Government should be applied for for the proposed work as it is as a subtributary of the Cauvery river. [The Hebbahalla is a tributary of the Hone-Hole, or Swarnavathi, which is a tributary of the Cauvery, and the question whether such consent is or is not necessary under the Mysore-Madras Cauvery Agreement of 1924 is not free from doubt.] The suggestion is being examined in another file

D.V.K.—26-11-37. M.S.K.—26-11-37.

P. MADHAVA MENON—29-11-37.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—29-11-37.

FINANCE (B.E. II) DEPARTMENT.

(Previous Finance Note on page 1 above.)

Please see paragraph 2 of Public Works Department above. If it is considered necessary to obtain the Mysore Government's consent to the execution of the proposed work, the question arises whether that Government will give their consent readily and whether the Public Works Department will be able, after obtaining the consent, to finish the work next year, i.e., to spend the entire demand of Rs. 12,500. Public Works Department may be requested to consider this point, and if necessary, to reduce the amount of the demand for next year.

The draft Part II Scheme note may otherwise be accepted and the following added as note by this department :—"The proposal may be considered as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39."

V.G.—30-11-37.

C.A.S.—30-11-37.

C.E.J.—30-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Please see the notes in the linked file*. Order of the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister and His Excellency may be taken whether the proposal had better be deferred till the consent of Mysore is obtained or whether the proposal may be pushed through as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39 on the assumption that it would be possible to start work before March 1939.

D.V.K.—2-12-37. M.S.K.—2-12-37.

If in the linked file* it is decided to make a reference to Mysore it will perhaps be better if this proposal is held up till we get a reply from Mysore.

P.M.M.—6-12-37.

K.R.M.—6-12-37.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—13-12-37.

This need not be held up and the letter to the Mysore Government should be on the basis of the project going on.

R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—14-12-37.

---

* Since disposed of in Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

With reference to the orders of the Hon'ble the Prime Minister in this and the linked file*, the Part II Scheme note in this file may issue at once and further action taken thereafter.

D.V.K.—20-12-37. P. MADHAVA MENON—20-12-37.

PART II SCHEME FOR 1938-39.

[Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.]

Summary.

Head of account.	Item of expenditure.	Ultimate cost.	Cost in 1938-39.
		RS.	RS.
18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues.	Construction of an anicut with a headsluice across the Hebbahalla river, Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.	12,500 (Non-recurring).	12,500 (Non-recurring).

NOTE BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The Hebbahalla river is a jungle stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam reserve forests of the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district. After a short course in British limits, it runs through Mysore State for about three miles before joining the Hone-Hole or Swarnavathi, a tributary of the Cauvery river.

2. The improvement of the irrigation sources in the Kollegal taluk has been engaging the attention of Government for a long time past and there have been several interpellations in the Legislative Council in the past on this subject. A number of schemes connected with the utilization of the waters of the Hebbahalla were considered between the years 1921—1929. The investigation of a reservoir scheme was commenced in 1924 and plans and estimates amounting to Rs. 2·65 lakhs were prepared in 1928. It was however abandoned in 1929 as it was found to be totally unremunerative. An alternative scheme for diverting the waters of the stream by constructing an anicut across it was prepared and it was estimated to cost Rs. 31,420. This scheme also had to be dropped as it was considered that it would not improve the existing supply.

3. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation has now submitted a modified scheme according to which an anicut with a headsluice will be constructed across the stream (Hebbahalla) and a channel excavated therefrom to augment the supply of water to a series of six tanks (Kottakarai), Hondrabalu, Doddaranganatham, Chickaranganatham, Kongankarai and Mudikondan tanks) and avoid the frequent remission in the areas irrigated by them The estimate for the excavation of the supply channel and its auxiliary works has been separately sanctioned for Rs. 15,000 and is being carried out under the special accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor works in the district.

The cost of the anicut and headsluice amounts to Rs. 12,500 and is chargeable to a different budget head, viz., 18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues. As the proposed scheme of the anicut, headsluice and supply channel will result in the saving of an annual remission of Rs. 1,559, the return will be 5·76 per cent on a total outlay of Rs. 27,500. If the anicut scheme alone is taken into consideration the return will be 12·5 per cent. The scheme is thus remunerative, apart from remedying the longstanding grievance of the ryots in the taluk about the inadequate supply of water for irrigation from the tanks. It is accordingly proposed to include a provision of Rs. 12,500 for the work in the Budget Estimate for 1938-39.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—29-11-37.

NOTE BY THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

The proposal may be considered as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39.

C. E. JONES—30-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

From the Chief Engineer (Irrigation), No. 1808/36-*B*-30, *dated 26th March* 1938.

Please see the letter to the Resident in Mysore No. 652, dated 29th March 1938. Funds have been included for the work in the Budget Estimate for 1938-39. For orders whether a draft order may be put up *now* approving the 'proposal' and the estimate, or

whether this may wait for two or three months to see whether the Mysore Government send any reply. (A copy of the letter to the Resident, dated 29th March 1938 has been sent to the Chief Engineer but the present letter from the Chief Engineer was written before the copy of the letter to the Resident was received by him.)

D.V.K.—2-4-38. M.S.K.—4-4-38. P. MADHAVA MENON—4-4-38.

Put up demi-official to Chief Engineer asking him whether there is any objection to the matter being held over for a couple of months to see if Mysore will have anything to say.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—4-4-38.

Draft demi-official submitted.

D.V.K.—4-4-38. M.S.K.—5-4-38. P.M.M.—5-4-38.
K.R.M.—5-4-38.

(1)

Demi-official from K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 5th April 1938, No. 3525-D/37-3.

[Your letter No. 1808/36-B-30, dated 26th March 1938.]

The Mysore Government have just been addressed in the matter and a copy of the letter (No. 652, dated 29th March 1938) has been sent to you. There is of course no objection to the Superintending Engineer proceeding with the preliminaries as instructed by you, but it is perhaps desirable to wait for a couple of months and see whether Mysore will have anything to say before orders formally sanctioning the proposal are issued. Will you kindly say whether there is any objection to this course of action ?

(2)

Demi-official from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 7/11th April 1938, No. 1808/36-B-32.

[*Reference.*—Demi-official letter No. 3525 D/37-3, dated 6th April 1938.]

I see no objection to the course of action indicated, and I have informed the Superintending Engineer accordingly.

Please see the Chief Engineer's demi-official above. No action is necessary now. The file may lie over till 1st August 1938.

D.V.K.—12-4-38. M.S.K.—12-4-38.

P.M.M.—12-4-38.

Please see notes from page 3 ante. For orders whether a reminder may be sent to the Resident in Mysore. The Hon'ble the Prime Minister's notes dated 8th January 1938 and 25th February 1938 on pages 11 and 15 Notes to Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938, indicate that we may await whatever reply Mysore chose to give before actually sanctioning the execution of the work on the construction of the anicut and head-sluice. A draft letter is submitted.

D.V.K.—1-8-38. M.S.K.—1-8-38.

The draft my issue, if considered necessary. It may, however, be inexpedient to do so. It would perhaps be better to construe the silence of the Mysore Darbar as implying consent and to proceed with the works.

K. G. MENON—1-8-38.

The draft may issue.

K.R.M.—2-8-38.

Mysore Government have not chosen to give any reply to our letter and I do not see why we should write to them that we presume they have no remarks to make. The Hon'ble the Prime Minister may again see the file.

The Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) is right. I take it he means that we need not write to the Government of Mysore on the subject now but go on as if they had no objection to make. But there is just one point to remember. We are writing not to the Government of Mysore direct, but to the Hon'ble the Resident. We may without spoiling our case, write to the Resident just asking him whether the subject of our letter of 29th March 1938, was duly intimated to the Government of Mysore. This might help us later on.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—4-8-38.

A | A confidential demi-official may be written to the Resident presuming that the purport of our letter has been communicated to the Mysore Government and that the latter has not chosen to make any comment on it. The Resident may be taken into our confidence as was done before (*cf.* demi-officials on pages 6-7 Notes to G.O. No. 164 I., dated 15th May 1922, on page 80 Notes to G.O. No. 282 I., dated 21st November 1922, and on page 1 Notes to Letter No. 103 I., dated 4th May 1923), and he may be asked not to press Mysore Government for a reply.

B |

Y[AKUB HASAN]—5-8-38.

I am sorry. I think that it will not be proper or useful to do what is said at **B**. In fact it may hurt us if we do it. Let the draft as it is, go. As suggested by the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) the letter may be marked Confidential. Perhaps His Excellency had better see.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—9-8-38.

It should be taken for granted that the Resident has communicated the purport of our letter to the Government of Mysore. Merely to ask him whether he has addressed that Government in the matter would be superfluous. It will serve no purpose. On the other hand when his attention is drawn to it, the Resident is sure to send a reminder to Mysore Government and will press them for a reply. In order to avoid this contingency the draft may remain as it is without the alteration suggested by the Hon'ble the Prime Minister. All that the Hon'ble the Prime Minister wants is that we should have a letter from the Resident that the purport of our communication was intimated to the Government of Mysore; his acknowledgment of our letter will serve that purpose for he will no doubt write that he has addressed Mysore in the matter but has received no reply from them.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—10-8-38.

After discussing the matter with the Hon'ble the Prime Minister over the phone I agree to the draft as amended by him.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—22-8-38.

E[RSKINE]—24-8-38.

Issue.

K. G. MENON—25-8-38.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—25-8-38.

[Letter to the Resident in Mysore, No. 3525-D/37-4, dated 25th August 1938.]

From the Resident in Mysore, No. F. 330/38, *dated 6th September* 1938.

Submitted.

2. Apparently, the further communication promised by the Resident has to be awaited before any further action is taken. For orders.

D.V.K.—8-9-38. M.S.K.—8-9-38. K.G.M.—8-9-38.

We may await further communication from the Resident. No action is necessary at present.

K.R.M—9-9-38.

Three reminders were addressed to Mysore Government by the Resident in June, July and August last but no reply has been vouchsafed; that shows that Mysore Government do not consider a reply necessary (as anticipated by us). We will wait for another month from the date of Resident's letter, i.e., 6th September 1938.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—10-9-38.

This is all right. And we need not, it seems, wait any more. The Resident's last letter to the Government of Mysore is stated to have been sent on 20th August and it is now 20 days since then.

R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—10-9-38.

A draft order is submitted.

2. It is, however, respectfully submitted that usually correspondence with Mysore lrags on for months and delay in replying to references by either Government (Madras or Mysore) is common as very great care is exercised in examining the proposals owing to the conflict of interests between the two Governments. As regards matters of the kind in question, the following two cases where intimation of the works proposed by Mysore was given to this Government under the Agreement of 1933 will illustrate the delay referred to :—

(1) *Doddamalur tank—Raising capacity—*
Date of first intimation from Mysore, 12th April 1934
Further particulars asked for by the Government, 5th June 1934.
Reminders on 18th July 1934, 8th November 1934 and 30th January 1935.
Particulars received, 11th March 1935.
Request from this Government to modify proposals, 29th June 1935
Reminder on 10th October 1935.
Mysore's rejoinder, 24th December 1935.
Madras Government's final reply agreeing to the proposals, 1st September 1936. (Letter No. 2062 I., dated 1st September 1936.)

(2) *Improvements to Koralkunte, etc., tanks—*
Date of first intimation from Mysore, 10th June 1935.
Further particulars asked for by this Government, 12th September 1935.
Reminders on 18th December 1935 and 26th March 1936.
Particulars received from Mysore, 8th May 1936 and 10th June 1936.
This Government's request to modify the proposals, 11th December 1936. (Letter No. 2855 I., dated 11th December 1936.)
Letter from this Government asking whether the modifications were given effect to, 27th April 1937.
Reminder on 18th August 1937.
Rejoinder from Mysore, 26th August 1937.
This Government's reply insisting on the modifications, 15th December 1937.
Reminders on 16th February 1938, 10th June 1938 and 3rd August 1938.
Matter still pending. (C. No. 1246-D/37.)

It will be seen that at every material stage in the correspondence in the above two cases, there was considerable delay on the part of each Government owing to the necessity for carefully scrutinizing the proposals to safeguard its own interests. There is no explicit binding that, under the 1933 Agreement, the Mysore Government should wait until this Government have had their say on the works about which intimation is given by the Mysore Government. Nevertheless, the convention is being gradually established that this Government have a *right* to raise objections—vide in this connection notes at bottom of pages 40, 43–44 and 47 of Letter No. 2855 I., dated 11th December 1936.

It is no doubt true that the Hebbahalla case dealt with in this file has been held not to come under the 1933 Agreement, but on the analogy of the two cases referred to above, it would appear preferable to wait for the Resident's reply before issuing the draft order. Otherwise Mysore may retaliate by not waiting for our objections even in cases coming within the scope of the 1892 and 1933 Agreements, and such a step would be greatly to our detriment. In the Hebbahalla case no harm will be done by waiting for Mysore's consent, and according to the Chief Engineer, they have no reasonable grounds to object—see top of pages 3 and 5 of Letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938. X

3. Revenue and Legal may see for remarks.

D.V.K.—13-9-38. M.S.K.—13-9-38. K. G. MENON—13-9-38.

X above : I am not sure. If the channels have been excavated, i.e., if the work has been completed or is expected to be completed soon, we ought to get on with the anicut. If on the other hand it will be a long time before the channels are completed, there can be no harm in postponing the anicut. What exactly is the position regarding the channels ? A

K. RAMUNNI MENON—13-9-38.

There is no information as to the progress on the channel excavation work. Presumably it must have been almost completed by now as it was taken up under the special accelerated programme which was closed as such by 31st March 1938, incomplete works being attended to by the regular Public Works Department staff. If definite information is required, the Chief Engineer will have to be asked. Draft telephone message submitted.

LEGAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft letter to the Resident in Mysore is in order.

2. Public Works Department will no doubt consider the suggestion made by the Revenue Secretary in his note on the previous page which explains clearly and supports the proposal made in the Chief Engineer's letter to Government.

A on the previous page.

K. V. RAJAGOPALAN—28-10-38.

P. APPU NAIR—28-10-38.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Revenue Secretary's note on page 8 ante and the Legal Department note (paragraph 2) above. The Chief Engineer's 'alternative' suggestion was considered carefully before the note on page 8 ante was written. It was thought that it would be inadvisable, and even risky, to go beyond what Mysore themselves ask as conditions for their acceptance of our proposals, and make alternative offers in modification of their conditions, which according to the Chief Engineer are by themselves unobjectionable from the point of view of our interests. The Chief Engineer does not seem to press his 'alternative' suggestion—*cf.* his final recommendation at A on page 9, current file—and in fact his remarks under item (*a*) on page 8 current file seem to be in explanation as to why he thinks we can agree to Mysore's condition to pass down the whole natural flow during the hot weather period. In the circumstances, it seems that no further action is called for on the 'alternative' suggestion—at any rate for the present. This may be adverted to later on if necessary when the anicut is completed, and it is found that water is required for second crop or seed beds.

2. Finance have not seen the file. It may be sent to that department before circulation to the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works), the Hon'ble Minister (Revenue), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister, and His Excellency the Governor.

D.V.K.—29-10-38. M.S.K.—29-10-38. K. G. MENON—29-10-38.

The argument in favour of the alternative suggestion is that since Mysore must pass down 1,000—1,200 cusecs in *view of her power requirements* Madras will not lose any water if her minimum demand is fixed at 900 cusecs *minus* a small figure, say 10 cusecs, representing the amount of water diverted by the proposed Hebbahalla anicut. We cannot be too certain that Mysore will always pass down 1,000—1,200 cusecs in view of her power requirements. The Shimsha project might possibly result in the gradual change over from Sivasamudram to Shimsha and the position might be reached under which Mysore will not be under the necessity to pass down anything more than the minimum fixed which is at present 900 cusecs. It is undesirable to do anything that might result in Mysore passing down anything less than this at some date in the future.

(There is a separate file * about this.)

K. RAMUNNI MENON—31-10-38.

FINANCE (B.E.-II) DEPARTMENT.

Please see the notes from page 8 above.

V.V.—2-11-38. The draft order may be accepted.

2. It is now stated that some expenditure will be incurred in the current year, as it is likely that only a small portion of the current year's budget provision (Rs. 12,500) will be spent, the Chief Engineer may be asked to surrender the balance.

V.V.—2-11-38.

This item will be removed from the Register of Part II Schemes.

V.G.—1-11-38. V. VARADACHARI—2-11-38.

C. A. SUNDARAM AYYAR—2-11-38.

C. E. JONES—3-11-38.

* Since recorded in G.O. No. 1279 I. (Confdl.), dated 23rd May 1939.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

In Letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938, the Mysore Government were apprised of the intention of this Government to proceed with a scheme for the utilization of the waters of the Hebbahalla river in the Coimbatore district, and it was added that this Government trusted that there was no objection to the work being proceeded with. In reply, the Mysore Government have stated that they would have no objection to the construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river provided that (*a*) the whole natural flow in the river is passed down during the hot weather (28th January to 27th May) and (*b*) sufficient check is afforded to Mysore to verify the natural flow at the site of the proposed anicut. The Chief Engineer, whose remarks were called for, has reported that both the conditions may be agreed to, as there is no flow worth mentioning in the river during the hot weather period, and as the ryots have undertaken to continue to grow as at present the usual dry broadcasted variety of paddy which is sown and reared with the help of occasional showers in July and August and irrigated thereafter till December. With regard to the verification of the natural flow at the site of the proposed anicut, the Chief Engineer presumes that a year's joint gaugings and a daily water card (i.e., a postcard intimation about daily gauge levels) will suffice.

It is accordingly proposed to tell Mysore that the conditions stipulated by them are agreed to and that the work is being proceeded with. Orders will be issued at the same time sanctioning the execution of the work. The draft order and letter placed below are on this basis.

Incidentally, Mysore have asked for information as to the works constructed by this Government on the Cauvery and its tributaries above the Sivasamudram anicut subsequent to the Mysore-Madras Agreement of 1924. The Chief Engineer has stated that there are no such works and has suggested that Mysore should be asked for similar information. The draft letter put up provides for this.

2. The reason adduced by Mysore for the condition imposed by them that the whole of the natural flow should be passed down the Hebbahalla river during the hot weather (28th January to 27th May) is that as the Hebbahalla joins the Cauvery through the Swaranavathi above their Sivasamudram anicut at which point a minimum supply of 900 cusecs is to be guaranteed to Madras during the hot weather period under the 1924 Agreement, any interruption of the flow in the Hebbahalla will reduce pro tanto the total quantity available for being passed down to Madras and will have to be made good by Mysore by increased issue from Krishnarajasagara. In commenting on this the Chief Engineer for Irrigation has stated as follows :—

"I wish to observe that the condition proposed by Mysore is apparently due to an inadequate appreciation of the position. Firstly, the Hebbahalla anicut is 13 miles upstream of the infall of the Swarnavathi into the Cauvery. Hence any small spring flow in summer at the proposed anicut site will be fully absorbed in charging the dry bed of the river and no water will ever reach the Cauvery. No extra issue from Krishnarajasagara will therefore be necessary.

K Secondly, to save Mysore this extra issue, Madras may say that she agrees to the deduction of this extra quantity from the 900 cusecs due to her at Sivasamudram during the hot weather. By doing so, Madras will not incur any real loss. For example, against 900 cusecs due to Madras, Mysore are now passing 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs in the interest of their own power supply. Assuming that the Hebbahalla anicut diverts 10 cusecs; the quantity due to Madras will be 900—10 or 890 cusecs, but still Mysore must pass the same 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs for her power requirements. Thus by agreeing to deduct the quantity diverted at the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to Madras, Madras will not only not lose any water but will be able to raise if she wishes a small second crop or at least to grow seed beds to start irrigation in time instead of waiting for the first freshes in June to raise seed beds."

The Revenue Secretary thinks that the Chief Engineer's suggestion contained at K above may be considered as an alternative to agreeing to the condition proposed by Mysore as we will not in practice be losing any water below Sivasamudram, and we can utilize the 10 cusecs (the quantity assumed as diverted by the Hebbahalla anicut) for raising a small second crop or for growing seed beds as stated by the Chief Engineer. This department consider it unnecessary to go beyond the conditions proposed by Mysore for the reasons given in the Secretary's note extracted below :—

"The argument in favour of the alternative suggestion is that since Mysore must pass down 1,000–1,200 cusecs *in view of her power requirements* Madras will not lose any water if her minimum demand is fixed at 900 cusecs *minus* a small figure say 10 cusecs representing the amount of water diverted by the proposed Hebbahalla anicut. We cannot be too certain that Mysore will always pass down 1,000–1,200 cusecs in view of her power requirements. The Shimsha

project might possibly result in the gradual change over from Sivasamudram to Shimsha (there is a separate file * about this; work on the Shimsha power scheme has already been begun by Mysore) and the position might be reached under which Mysore will not be under the necessity to pass down anything more than the minimum fixed which is at present 900 cusecs. It is undesirable to do anything that might result in Mysore passing down anything less than this at some date in the future."

During my visit to Sivasamudram in May last the local Engineer told me that the new reservoir has been constructed there *with a view to avoid the necessity of passing down more than 900 cusecs.*

Y[AKUB HASAN]—12-11-38.

The Chief Engineer himself has not pressed this alternative suggestion, as his final recommendation is that we may agree to the two conditions proposed by Mysore. The passage in his letter extracted on the previous page appears to be intended to elucidate his point that we need not object to passing down the hot weather flow. No mention is therefore made of this alternative suggestion in the draft letter put up.

3. The draft order, and the draft letter to Mysore which has been scrutinized by the Legal Department, may be submitted to the Hon'ble Ministers (Public Works) and (Revenue), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister, and His Excellency for approval.

D.V.K.—7-11-38. M.S.K—8-11-38. K. G. MENON—8-11-38.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—9-11-38.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—12-11-38.

T. P[RAKASAM]—12-11-38.

I have added a phrase.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—15-11-38.

E[RSKINE]—16-11-38.

Issue.

The remarks of the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) are important. They should be extracted and put up in the file * relating to Shimsha.

K.R.M.—17-11-38.

[G.O. No. 2443 I., dated 17th November 1938.]

The draft order and Letter have been issued as Nos. 2443-44 I., dated 17th November 1938.

2. The Shimsha file * has been sent to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation u.o. for remarks on the points raised in the Secretariat note in that file. Extract of the Hon'ble Minister's (Public Works) remarks and Secretary's note above will be placed in that file on return from Chief Engineer for Irrigation. Meanwhile, it seems desirable to inform the Chief Engineer confidentially as to why his 'alternative suggestion' has not been put to Mysore. A draft demi-official is submitted. The demi-official also asks the Chief Engineer to surrender the unspent portion (as far as can be estimated at present) of the budget allotment in the current year for the anicut and headsluice portion of the Hebbahalla scheme—vide paragraph 2 of Finance Department's note on page 9 ante.

This does not appear to be necessary.

K.G.M.—22-11-38.

3. After issue of the demi-official, the file may be sent to Revenue for perusal of the notes from page 9 ante.

D.V.K.—22-11-38. M.S.K.—22-11-38. K.G.M.—22-11-38.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Please see paragraph 3 of the Public Works notes above.

2. The previous notes of this department are at page 8 ante. The notes from page 9 above may be perused, and the file returned to Public Works.

M.V.M.—24-11-38. V.N.R.—25-11-38. T. M. S. MANI—26-11-38.

B. G. HOLDSWORTH—26-11-38.

* Since recorded in G.O. No. 1279 I. (Confdl.), dated 23rd May 1939.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

2. In view of Under Secretary's marginal remarks on the previous page, a draft memorandum to the Chief Engineer regarding surrender of the unspent allotment is put up for approval.

[An explanatory demi-official to the Chief Engineer was put up in regard to his 'alternative' suggestion because it was thought that the Chief Engineer might know the views of the Government informally on this important matter so as to have a clear understanding between ourselves in our relations with Mysore.]

D.V.K.—29-11-38. M.S.K.—29-11-38. K. G. MENON—29-11-38.

[Memorandum to the Chief Engineer issued as No. 3525-D/37-10, dated 30th November 1938.]

There is no harm in sending the demi-official. It may issue.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—5-12-38.

(1)

Memorandum No. 3525 *D/37-10, P.W.D., dated* 30*th November* 1938.

[Hebbahalla Scheme—Coimbatore district.]

The scheme for the construction of the anicut and head sluice was approved in G.O. No. 2443 I., dated 17th November 1938. The full amount of the estimate (Rs. 12,500) has been provided for in the current year's budget. As however only a small amount is likely to be spent during the year, the Chief Engineer is requested to surrender the balance of the provision not likely to be required.

K. RAMUNNI MENON,
Secretary to Government.

Demi-official from K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated the 5th December 1938, No. 3525-D/37-11.

[Hebbahalla scheme—Coimbatore district—Your Letter No. 1808/36-B-38, dated 15th October 1938.]

Orders have been issued in G.O. No. 2443 I., dated 17th November 1938, sanctioning the execution of the scheme, and the Mysore Government have been informed in Letter No. 2444, dated 17th November 1938, that this Government agree to the conditions imposed by Mysore and are proceeding with the work.

2. In your letter quoted above, you suggest that this Government may agree to deduct the extra quantity of water drawn by the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to them at Sivasamudram during the hot weather, as by doing so, they will not incur any real loss In view of the Mysore Government's recent activities on the Shimsha Hydro-electric Scheme * there might be a gradual change over from Sivasamudram to Shimsha, and the position might be reached under which Mysore will not be under the necessity to pass down at Sivasamudram anything more than the minimum of 900 cusecs. In fact, during his visit to Sivasamudram in May last, the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works was it is understood informed by the local Mysore Engineer that the reservoir on the Shimsha was being constructed with a view to avoid the necessity of passing down at Sivasamudram more than the 900 cusecs prescribed. You will, in the circumstances, no doubt agree that it is not desirable to adopt your suggestion, and tell Mysore that we are prepared to accept a quantity less than 900 cusecs to be passed down Sivasamudram. No mention has accordingly been made of this in the letter to Mysore.

* Vide papers sent to you with this department U.O. No. 4178-D/38-1, dated 21st October 1938.

[Since recorded in G.O. No. 1279 I. (Confdl.), dated 23rd May 1939.]

36-- / 17/11 **DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.**

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying		
When copied	17/11	
When examined		
When signed		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT :— PWD(I)

Irrign - Projects - Coimbatore — Kollegal taluk - Hebbahalla Scheme - Sanctioned

READ AGAIN G.O.No. 559 I, dated 19.2.1929. (A)

" " Letter No. 652 I 29.3.1938 (B)

READ *ALSO* :—

No. ____ From the Hon'ble Resident, No. R.Dis. F330/38 dated 28.9.1938 pp24-

" ____ " C.E. (I) in my file " 1058/38 & 26 28.9.1938 pp28-3

" ____ " CE(I) " 1868/38 & 1570/38 1938 pp31-3

Order ~~Mrs.~~ No. 2443 dated 17-11-1938.

~~Resolution Rout.~~

The Govt approve the expre. of Rs 12,500/- on the construction of an ancient aerro the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore Dt.

2. The expenditure is debitable to "18 - Irrign - ORE financed from ordy revenues - Irrign works - Works for which neither capital nor Rev Accts are kept" ~~out~~

3. The following letter will be sent to the Hon'ble the Resident in his/our

ORDINARY. PREFERENCE. URGENT (a).

Confidential

..... DEPARTMENT.

SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS
25 OCT 1939
MADRAS

Current No....., dated ..... 19..

G.O. No. 2443-44, dated 17-4 1939.

Number of MS. pages sent (b) Correspondence 38
(b¹) Notes 43

ef subject: Hebbahalla Scheme - Compulsory

(c) Number of copies required when struck off (*not including copies for volumes and editors' table which are retained in the Press*).	E.T. copies to supply requisitions for purchase by the public.	Complete correspondence and orders.	Notes.
FOR RECORD.*			
Madras Records		25	25
Ooty Records		4	4
For filing with original		1	1
Total ...		30	30

FOR ISSUE.†

	Letter only.	Complete G.O.	Special issue copies of G.O. (b) No.	Special issue copies of G.O. (b) Papers.	Notes.
Signature copies					
India Office					
Govt. of India ..... Dept.					
Revenue Department					
Public Works Department					
Local and Municipal Department					
Educational Department					
..... Dept.					
Public Dept. / Judicial Dept. / Political / Financial Dept. / Marine Dept. / Ecclesiastical Dept. — Total ...					
Total ...					
Spare copies. The CE (I)		10			
The Dy Chief		5			
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
The					
Total ...		15			

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SECRETARIAT.

(a) If a paper is marked to be printed urgently the Superintendent of the section concerned should sign the Press slip. The Superintendent should exercise a careful discretion in the matter.

(b) Each letter, memorandum, or order, or set of orders, in the file of correspondence should be headed in succession with the Roman numeral I, II, III, etc., the number being written in red ink or blue chalk above the item. The particular papers to be printed in the special issue-copies should be indicated by the Roman numeral (I, II, etc.) by which that item had been headed in the correspondence file. All matter, including marginal remarks or references, to be printed should be written in ink and matter which should not be printed should be encircled. Initials and signatures that are not quite legible should be re-written distinctly.

(b¹) For rules regarding printing of notes, see rule 315 of the Office Manual.

(c) The number of copies and the details of distribution should be filled in by the Superintendent or Referencer concerned.

(d) In the absence of special instructions to the Press to keep matter standing for a specified period, ordinary papers of 8 pages and under will be kept standing for *one* week, and larger papers for *two* weeks only. *The type of notes and of all confidential papers is distributed immediately after striking.*

(e) This slip, properly and completely filled in, should accompany every paper sent to Press; it will be returned by the Press when proofs are furnished; it should be sent to the Press when a call is made for revised proofs or when a corrected proof is sent for striking. When finally returned by Press it should be filed with the original order or letter.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE PRESS.

(a) If, in the opinion of the Superintendent of the Press, a paper has been marked urgent unnecessarily, he should send the Press slip to the Registrar with a remark to that effect.

(b) Unless a note to the contrary is made against the matter, pencil entries should not be printed. The Superintendent of the Press may bring to the notice of the Registrar any instance of incomplete or careless editing.

(c) Signature copies of letters to the Secretary of State or to the Government of India should be printed on hand-made paper.

(d) This slip should be returned by the Press to the Secretariat when proofs are furnished; it will be sent back to the Press when proofs are returned corrected and should be finally returned to the Secretariat when struck-off copies are supplied.

(e) The names of the Secretary and Members should be printed in full when they occur on the right hand side, only the first time when they appear on the left side, the initials alone being printed later.

TO PRESS, MADRAS, OOTY.

Please send proof in duplicate. The papers have been carefully edited.

Referencer.
Clerk.

24 x 25

Supt.

Proof returned corrected. Please strike off and send number of copies as indicated.

Type may be released ~~after~~ after usual interval. at once.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Supt.

As the matter is clear manuscript and has been carefully edited, (*b*) proof need not be sent. Please print and supply number of copies as indicated. Type may be released after usual interval.

Referencer.
Clerk.

Supt.

Government of Madras

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

(Irrigation)

G.O. No. 2443, 17th November 1938

Irrigation—Projects—Coimbatore—Kollegal taluk—Hebbahalla Scheme—Sanctioned.

READ—the following papers :—

G.O. No. 559 I., dated 19th February 1929

Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938

Endorsement No. 891/37 D-22. dated 22nd October 1937.

NOTE ON PART II SCHEMES. 1938–39

Head of account	18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure finance from ordinary Revenues—Accounts not kept.
Item of expenditure	Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla-Kollegal taluk—Coimbatore district.
Estimated cost ..	Rs. 12,500.
Programme, 1938–39 ..	Rs. 12,500.

In April 1936, the Collector of Coimbatore reported that irrigation sources in th Kollegal taluk suffered badly in recent years due to failure of seasonal rains, resulting i heavy remissions. He suggested that the proposal abandoned in G.O. No. 559 I., date 19th February 1929, should be reconsidered and worked out in two parts : (1) the channe part requiring unskilled labour under Special Accelerated programme, and (2) the anicu and sluice part, requiring skilled labour as a contribution work. In approving these pro posals in Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936, the Board of Revenu also decided that in view of the remoteness and unhealthiness of the tract, and of th general poverty of the ryots concerned no contribution need be demanded from the ryot for the proposed anicut.

After some correspondence an estimate for Rs. 15,000 for excavating a supply channel was sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer under the Accelerated Programme

An estimate for an anicut and a sluice for Rs. 12,500 for works (and Rs. 16,28 including establishment and other charges) has now been received from the Superintend ing Engineer.

Hebbahalla is a jungle stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam Reserve forests of the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district. After a short course in British limits it runs through Mysore territory for about three miles before joining Hone-Hole which falls into the Cauvery. The proposed anicut across Hebbahalla will divert a portion of the river flow into the following existing tanks :—

(1) Kottakarai, (2) Hondrabalu, (3) Doddaranganatham, (4) Chikkaranganatham, (5) Konganakarai, (6) Mudikondam.

This proposal aims at improving the supplies to the existing ayacut under the tanks and no extension of ayacut is propose

As the stream runs partly in Madras and partly in Mysore, the implications of the agreements with Mysore were examined and Government have decided that the work may be taken up—vide this office Letter No. 1808/36 B-14, dated 7th June 1937, and Govern ment Demi-official No. 1743 D/37-3, dated 28th August 1937.

Financial aspect.—The average annual remission under the tanks benefited by the scheme has been assessed by the Collector at Rs. 1,559. The anicut scheme will return about 12·5 per cent on the outlay of Rs. 12,500 or 9·45 per cent or Rs. 16,286 inclusive of percentage charges.

Submitted to Government. The estimate for the anicut and headsluice is under scrutiny and will be submitted to Government by about the 25th instant. The work is very urgent as without the anicut, the channel (being excavated under the accelerated programme) will not function effectively. The scheme may be included in the Part II Schemes for 1938-39.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

III

Letter from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 25th October 1937, No. 1808/36-B 20.

I forward for approval of Government an estimate for Rs. 12,500 (for works) for constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla. My Letter No. 1808/36-B-14, dated 7th June 1937, * to Government and Board's Endorsements H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936 and No. 2612/36, dated 26th October 1936 (copies enclosed), explain the necessity for the work. The estimate report gives details of the proposed work.

2. The work has been proposed for inclusion in Part II Schemes—vide my Endt. No. 891/37-D-22, dated 22nd October 1937.

Report to accompany the estimate for constructing an anicut with headsluice across the Hebbahalla River, Kollegal Taluk.

[Estimate Rs. 12,500. Plans S. Nos. 4 and 14/37 and 207/37.]

This estimate is prepared in accordance with the instructions contained in the endorsements Nos. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936 and No. 2612/36, dated 26th October 1936, of the Board of Revenue wherein the Board has approved of an expenditure of Rs. 14,500 for excavation of a supply channel from the Hebbahalla to the Kottakarai tank and Rs. 12,550 for constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla. The estimate for the supply channel with its auxiliary works has been separately sanctioned for Rs. 15,000 in C.R. No. 1 S.W.-193/38 and is being carried out under the Scheme of Accelerated Programme of Works.

2. The proposal to construct an anicut across the Hebbahalla and take a channel from it is to augment the supplies to a system of tanks in the locality and avoid frequent remissions in the areas irrigated by them. The tanks benefited are (1) Kottakarai, (2) Hondrabalu, (3) Doddaranganatham, (4) Chickaranganatham, (5) Kongankarai and (6) Mudikondan.

3. The proposed anicut is to be situated about 2½ miles from the Kottakarai tank near R.F. stone No. 60 where the halla comes out of the steep hills and reserve forests. The halla drains 11·9 square miles of hilly slopes clad with forests.

4. The anicut will be built at the site shown in the plans. The bed and the banks are rocky and afford good foundation for the anicut. The anicut will be of random rubble in cement mortar (1 : 5) pointed in cement (1 : 3). It will be 101′ long and 10·6′ high at the deepest point with a base width of 7′ 3″ and top width of 5′ 0″. The top 1′ 0″ will have a coping of concrete broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 3. The anicut is designed to discharge a flood of 2,781 cusecs with a head of 4·08′.

5. The foundations of the anicut on soft rock will be 4′ 0″ cement concrete (broken stone in cement mortar 1 : 4) for a length of 22′ from the left end and the remaining portion will be built on hard rock benched and dressed.

6. The anicut will be protected by an upstream apron 22′ long and 50′ wide at the left end (where the sub-soil is soft rock) consisting of 2′ 0″ puddle clay and 1′ 6″ dry stone packing on top. The top level of the apron will be + 116·50. On the downstream side there will be an impervious apron for a width of 46′ consisting of 1′ 6″ cement concrete 1 : 4 and roughstone in cement mortar on top 1′ 6″ thick. A second apron 24′ 0″ wide will be provided consisting of ordinary roughstones 1′ 6″ thick.

* Printed on pages 1-3 of Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

7. There will be a scouring sluice in the anicut at its right end with a ventway 4′ 6″ wide by 5′ 0″ high, with its sill at R.L. + 119·50 operated by a screw shutter. There will be a breast wall over a cutstone lintel to limit the size of the vent. The side walls of the scouring sluice will be 3′ 0″ thick. As the sill of the scouring sluice is 2·5′ lower than the sill of the head sluice, it is expected that the channel in front of the headsluice can be kept clear of silt by periodically working the scouring sluice.

8. The headsluice will consist of 2 vents each 4′ 6″ wide by 3′ 6″ high with a pier 2′ 3″ thick. The sill of the sluice will be 2·5′ above that of the scouring sluice, i.e., at R.L. + 122·00. The sluice is designed to discharge 200 cusecs for 2½ days during floods sufficient to fill up the Kotakarai and Hondrabalu tanks, and half of Doddaranganatham, Chickaranganatham, Kongankarai and Mudigundan tanks. The level of the sluice platform will be at + 132·50, i.e., 2·82′ above + 129·68, the M.F.L. above the anicut. The sluice will be worked by screw shutters from a cutstone platform and the anicut crest will be reached by a flight of ste

9. On the right bank, there will be an abutment connecting to hard rock there. On the left bank, the body wall of the anicut will be carried to the outcorp of rock and abutment and wings will be omitted. A lump sum provision for revetment has been made to revet the left bank above and below the anicut where necessary.

10. As the channel downstream of the head sluice will run alongside the halla for the first 200′ a masonry wall is necessary on the left side of the channel. A wall will be built with its stop at + 127·25, i.e., 0·5′ above the observed M.F.L. + 126·75 of the river at the site. Provision for the wall has been made in the estimate for excavating the supply channel. The nose between the halla and the channel will be revetted

11. The estimate also contains provision for the following :

Ring bund and baling.

Temporary road to anicut site for inspection, etc.

Temporary shed for materia

Acquisition of land (1 acre).

12. The supply channel costs Rs. 15,000 and the anicut Rs. 12,500. The average annual remission on lands irrigated by the tanks which the scheme will benefit works to Rs. 1,559—vide Collector's report No. 12860/35-A-2, dated 12th October 1936.

A. R. VENKATACHARI,
Deputy Chief Engineer for Irrigatio

Endorsement of the Board of Revenue, H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936.

Read—the following

1. G.O. No. 559 I., dated 19th February 1929.
2. Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, Ref. No. 12860/35, dated 17th April 1936.
3. Letter from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, No. 1808–36-B-2, dated 1st September 1936.

The proposal is to divert the Hebbahalla stream water into the catchment of the Kottakarai tank of Kollegal taluk, by excavating a supply channel from the stream and by constructing an anicut across it. The cost of the former involving mainly unskilled labour is reported to be Rs. 14,500 and that of the latter Rs. 12,550. These works will augment the supplies to a system of tanks in the locality and the tanks to be benefited are Kottakarai, Hondrabalu, Doddaranganatham, Chikkaranganatham and Kongalkarai. As the Mudukondam tank lies alongside Kongalkarai and is connected with it, it will also be equally benefited by the scheme.

Besides these tanks, the Hampapuram tank and the Pappankarai channel from the Gondal river, are also likely to be benefited by the scheme. But as they are at the tail-end of the system of tanks and have to depend on the surplus of the upper tanks, the Board does not propose to take their ayacuts into consideration for purposes of examining the financial aspects of the scheme.

2. The Collector and the Executive Engineer consider that although there will be no extensions of irrigation, the existing ayacuts now suffering from deficiency of supplies will be immensely benefited and that remissions which are now being granted, will be saved to the Government. The earlier reports of the Executive Engineer of 1927 and 1931 and the present reports do not

show clearly whether there will be enough supplies in the river in October and November for diversion into the tanks. But the report of the Executive Engineer dated 6th July 1936 written after inspection on 23th June 1936 clearly indicates that the rains at the end of May could have been usefully diverted into the tanks if there had been a supply channel and that such an additional supply would enable the starting of early cultivation by the ryots and obviate the need for supplies in the latter part of the irrigation season in October-November. The Board therefore considers that the scheme would save the remissions which are now being granted under the system of tanks. The following table * compiled from the irrigation accounts of the villages concerned, shows the amounts of the remissions granted during the last ten years. The average annual remission which will be saved by the scheme is Rs. 1,821 or Rs. 1,800 in round figures.

3. The Board accepts the Chief Engineer's proposal to include the excavation of the supply channel in the special accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor irrigation works, as it will provide work for the rural population and as it will, at the same time, make the tanks more efficient sources of irrigation. The Chief Engineer is accordingly requested to provide funds in the current and the next official years and to arrange for the starting and completion of the work as expeditiously as possible.

4. Without an anicut across the Hebbahalla stream, the supply channel to be excavated under the special accelerated and widespread programme would not be of much use. The construction of the anicut is an entirely new work in respect of which the sanction of the Government seems necessary. Even if the cost of the supply channel (which being financed from the grant for the special and accelerated programme may not yield any return) is added to the cost of the anicut, the saving on remissions will amount to a return of 6¼ per cent on the estimated total cost. In view of the remoteness and unhealthiness of the tract and of the general poverty of the ryots concerned, the Board does not propose to demand any contribution from the ryots. The Chief Engineer is therefore requested to take early steps for the sanction and execution of the scheme.

5. The Collector of Coimbatore is requested to have the figures in paragraph 2 above verified at an early date and to report whether the Board's estimate of the average savings in remission of Rs. 1,800 per annum, is correct and may be assumed for purposes of the revenue forecast.

D. I. R. MUIR,
Joint Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Collector of Coimbatore.

(3)

Endorsement of the Board of Revenue, H. No. 2612/36, dated 26th October 1936.

Read—the following

1. Board's Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936.
2. Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 12th October 1936, Ref. No. 12860/35-A-2.

In its endorsement read above, the Board requested the Chief Engineer for Irrigation to take early steps for the sanction and execution of the Hebbahalla diversion scheme consisting of (1) excavation of the supply channel at a cost of Rs. 14,500 under the special accelerated and widespread programme and (2) the construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla at a cost of Rs. 12,550. From the figures compiled from the irrigation accounts of the villages concerned which were available in the Board's office, it was found that the average annual remissions granted was Rs. 1,800 and that the savings in remissions would give a return of 6¼ per cent on the estimated total cost of both the items of work. It was also thought that the ayacuts of part of the Pappangarai channel and of the Doddaranganatham channel would be benefited from the augmented supplies in the Doddaranganatham tank, as they lie adjacent to the tank ayacut and below it. The Collector now reports that the ayacuts of these channels will not be benefited. According to the average remission figures furnished by the Collector the return on the scheme on the whole will be 5·76 per cent, i.e., 0·24 per cent less than the 6 per cent necessary to satisfy the criterion of productivity. But this is 0·76 per cent higher than the return prescribed for protective works in the taluk in G.O. No. 433-I, dated 21st February 1933. The Board considers that even on the basis of the expected return of 5·76 per cent the scheme may be proceeded with.

D. I. R. MUIR,
Joint Secretary.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
Collector of Coimbatore.

* Not received in the Secretariat.

(4)

Letter from the Collector of Coimbatore, dated 12th October 1936, Ref. No. 12860/35-A-2.

[*Reference.*—Board's Endorsement H. No. 907/36, dated 7th September 1936.]

The Tahsildar of Kollegal reports that the average annual remission under the several irrigation works affected by the Hebbahalla Project comes to Rs. 1,559 only as against Rs. 1,821 worked out in the Board's office. A statement * showing the remission granted under each source during the last ten faslis with an explanatory memorandum for the difference between these and Board's figures is enclosed :—

(5)

Estimate—Abstract.

Constructing an anicut across the Hebbahalla river with a headsluice

Item number.	Quantity.	Description of work.	Rate.	Per	Amount.
					RS.
1	35,000 c.ft.	Earthwork excavation in red earth gravel, etc., with 2 extra leads and 2 extra lifts M.D.S.S. 20 B.	7	,000 c.ft.	245
2	31,000 c.ft.	Excavation in soft disintegrated rock with two extra leads and two extra lifts.	12	,,	372
3	16,000 c.ft.	Blasting rock	10	100 c.ft.	1,600
4	L.S.	Benching and dressing blasted surface	L.S.	..	150
5	2,800 c.ft.	Concrete broken stone in cement mortar	42/4	100 c.ft.	1,183
6	530 c.ft.	Concrete broken stone in cement mortar	51	,,	270
7	9,800 c.ft.	Roughstone in cement mortar 1 : 5	42/8	,,	4,165
8	5,300	Pointing with cement mortar 1	4/14	100 c.ft.	258
9	125 c.ft.	Cutstone in cement mortar	168/3	100 c.ft.	210
10	L.S.	Roughstone revetment in left bank and for protecting nose, cushion wall for apron etc.		L.S.	758
11	2,200 c.ft.	Puddle clay	7/2	100 c.ft.	157
12	2,500 c.ft.	Roughstone apron	16/14	,,	422
13	L.S.	Teakwood shutters for scouring sluice and headsluice with screw gearing arrangements, etc., completed.	L.S.		1,000*
14	L.S.	Forming ring bund and baling water (if necessary)	L.S.		100
15	L.S.	Forming temporary road	L.S.		300
16	L.S.	Temporary shed for materials	L.S.		400
17		One acre land acquisition			50
18		Supervision charges } at 5 per cent .. .. Contingencies }			584
19		Unforeseen works, to meet extra cost of land compensation and extra cost of shutters if any required during execution.			284
		Grand total of estimate.			12,500

* The actual cost of the shutters will be ascertained from Public Works Workshops before starting the work.

IV

Telephonic message from the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Fort Saint George, the 14th December 1937.

[Part II Schemes—Order of urgency.]

Orders are being taken whether Mysore should be addressed in reference to the Hebbahalla scheme, and it is proposed to hold up its consideration as a Part II Scheme pending a reply from that Government. If, for some reason, the Part II Scheme does not materialise, the work on the excavation of the supply channel will probably be a waste to a large extent. Please say whether, in the circumstances, it will not be preferable to hold up work on the supply channel for the present.

Telephonic message from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 17th December 1937, No. 1808/36-B-24.

[*Reference.*—Your Telephonic message dated 14th December 1937.]

It is most unlikely that Mysore will object to the anicut. Even if they do, the channel without the anicut will ensure some extra supply to the tanks. Besides, the cost of the channel is being debited to the accelerated scheme which was intended to provide relief for unemployment, and not for productive schemes. I therefore think it would be a mistake to stop work on the channel. I do not propose to take any action to postpone the channel work without a special order from Government.

VI

Letter from F. M. Dowley, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated the 26th March 1938, No. 1808/36-B-30.

I invite reference to the correspondence ending with my No. 308/36-B-25,* dated 19th January 1938, and request you kindly to let me know if a reply from Mysore has been received.

I have asked the Superintending Engineer to proceed with the preliminaries connected with the construction of the anicut and headsluice without committing Government to any expenditure.

VII

Letter from K. Kamunni Menon, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of Madras, to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, dated Fort St. George, the 25th August 1938, No. 3525-D/37-4.

I am directed to invite attention to my letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938, and to ask whether the subject of that letter was intimated to the Government of Mysore.

VIII

Letter from the Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, the 6th September 1938, R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O. I.

With reference to your letter No. 3525-D/37-4, dated the 25th August 1938, I am directed to say that the contents of your letter No. 652-P. W. (I.), dated 29th March 1938, were intimated to the Government of Mysore on 20th April 1938 with an enquiry whether they had any objection to the works referred to being proceeded with. They were reminded on 4th June 1938, 12th July 1938 and 20th August 1938 but have not yet replied. A further communication will be addressed to you on receipt of their reply.

Telephonic message from ~~K. Kamunni Menon, Esq., I.C.S.~~, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 14th September 1938.

[*Reference.*—Hebbahalla Scheme—Your Demi-official No. 1808/36-B-32, dated 11th April 1938.]

Will you kindly ascertain and report urgently whether work on the supply channel taken up under the special programme has been completed or is nearing completion, and also the latest date by which it is necessary to commence work on the anicut and headsluice?

Endorsement No. 1808/36-B-37, dated 26th September 1938.

[From the Executive Engineer, Salem division, Salem, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, No. 1657, S.E., dated 18th September 1938. *Reference.*—Your Memorandum No. 1808/36-B-36, dated 15th September 1938.]

The work on the supply channel is nearing completion. In this year's budget, a sum of Rs. 12,500 was allotted for the execution of the anicut work. When sending the alterations to this year's budget at the end of August, I have proposed to reduce the grant for this year to Rs. 2,500 as the plans and estimate for the work have not yet been sanctioned. Even if the plans and estimate were sanctioned now, it would not be possible for me to call for tenders and complete the work and spend the full grant of Rs. 12,500 during the current year. As this is the rainy season, there is likely to be water in the Hebbahalla until the end of November. Consequently, if the plans and estimates are sanctioned, I now propose to start the work in December and give it a good start during the current year and for this, a reduced grant of Rs. 2,500 has been asked. If this is done, the work could be completed by the end of June or July next, and the anicut would be ready for the next season.

---

*Printed on page 6 of Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

As it will take about two months to call for tenders and complete agreements, I think that it will be necessary that the plans and estimate should be sanctioned before the end of October and that the work should be started by the middle of December, if we are to spend the revised grant of Rs. 2,500 asked for during the current year and complete the anicut and have it ready for use by the end of June next.

Copy submitted to Government with reference to the telephonic message, dated 14th September 1938.

F. M. Dowley,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Letter from the Secretary to the Hon'ble the Resident of Mysore, to the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, dated Bangalore, the 28th September 1938, R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O.I.

[Your letter No. 652-P.W. (I.), dated the 29th March 1938.]

In continuation of my letter R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O I., dated the 6th September 1938, I am directed to forward a copy of letter from the Government of Mysore No. 510/K.S.S, 1325, dated the 16th September 1938, and to request that this Residency may kindly be informed of the views of the Government of Madras in the matter. I am also to request that if there is no objection, the list of irrigation works asked for by the Government of Mysore in paragraph 3 of their letter may kindly be sent to this Residency.

Letter from the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Public Works Department, Krishnarajasagara Works, Bangalore, dated the 16th September 1938, No. 510/K.S.S. 1325.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter R. Dis. No. F. 330-38/R.O.I., dated the 20th April 1938, addressed to the Secretary to Government of Mysore, Public Works Department, forwarding a copy of letter No. 652-P.W. (I.), dated the 29th March 1938, from the Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, and enquiring whether the Mysore Government have any objection to the construction of the above anicut.

2. I am to state that under the Agreement of 1924 between the Madras and Mysore Government, a minimum flow of 900 cusecs has to be ensured to Madras at the Sivasamudram anicut from the 28th January to 27th May. During this period, the Hebbahalla along with other streams, contributes its share of water as the Suvarnavathi river (to which Hebbahalla is a feeder) joins the river Cauvery above the Sivasamudram anicut. The construction of the above anicut with feeder channel will naturally divert the whole flow or a large portion of it and the deficit caused by such diversion of flow requires to be made good by extra issue from the Krishnarajasagar reservoir to keep up the 900 cusecs at Sivasamudram. If the Madras Government agree to pass down the anicut now proposed to be constructed the natural flow in the Hebbahalla during the said period, i.e., from 28th January to 27th May (both days inclusive) and if sufficient checks to verify the natural flow at the anicut are provided, the Mysore Government will have no objection to the work being proceeded with. I request you will be so good as to bring the above facts to the notice of the Madras Government, and request them to keep the work under suspense till a final understanding is arrived at.

XIII

Endorsement No. 1058/38-D-16, dated 28th September 1938.

NOTE ON PART II SCHEMES—1939-40.

Head of account.—'18' Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues—*a.* Works.

Item of expenditure.—Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla-Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.

Estimated cost.—Rs. 12,500.

Programme, 1939-40.—Rs. 12,500.

[Summary same as on page 1 ante.]

Submitted to Government. Government provided Rs. 12,500 for the work in the current year's budget (Budget Estimate, 1938-39), as a Part II Scheme, under 18—Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure—*a.* Works Major. Plans and estimate for the work sent for approval in my No. 1808/36-B-20, dated the 25th October 1937, are now with Government. Please see my Endorsement No. 1808/36-B-37, dated the 26th September 1938, about anticipated expenditure on the work in the current year. If Government are unable to authorise the starting of the work sufficiently early, it may not be possible to commit Government to expenditure in the current year—vide paragraph 56 of the Budget Manual, Second Edition, and the work will have to be considered again as Part II Scheme for 1939-40. As this position may occur when it is too late to propose the work as a Part II Scheme for 1939-40, the proposal is now put up as Part II Scheme for 1939-40 for consideration if Government anticipate any delay in sanctioning the scheme.

F. M. DOWLEY,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

XIV

Letter from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to the Secretary to the Government, Public Works Department, dated the 15th October 1938, No. 1808/38-B-38.

The Mysore Government say that they have no objection to the Hebbahalla Scheme being proceeded with by this Government if (*a*) the whole natural flow in the Hebbahalla is passed down during the hot weather 28th January to 27th May and (*b*) sufficient checks are afforded to Mysore to verify the natural flow at the proposed anicut site.

Item (*a*).—The Hebbahalla was gauged during the hot weather in 1938 and I note in the margin, the actual flow during that period. It will be seen that there is practically no flow worth mentioning. Secondly, the ryots have agreed to continue to grow the usual dry broadcasted variety of paddy now grown—please see copies of the letters from the paddy specialist and the Superintending Engineer. Hence we may agree to pass the whole natural flow during the hot weather period.

Month.	Gauged discharge in m.c. ft.
February 1938	Nil.
March	Nil.
April	Nil.
May	2·625

I wish however to observe that the condition proposed by Mysore is apparently due to an inadequate appreciation of the position. Firstly, the Hebbahalla anicut is 13 miles upstream of the infall of the Swaranavathi into the Cauvery. Hence any small spring flow in summer at the proposed anicut site will be fully absorbed in charging the dry bed of the river and no water will ever reach the Cauvery. No extra issue from Krishnarajasagara will therefore be necessary. Secondly, to save Mysore this extra issue, Madras may say that she agrees to the deduction of this extra quantity from the 900 cusecs due to her at Sivasamudram during the hot weather. By doing so, Madras will not incur any real loss. For example, against 900 cusecs due to Madras, Mysore are now passing 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs in the interest of their own power supply. Assuming that the Hebbahalla anicut diverts 10 cusecs, the quantity due to Madras will be 900—10 or 890 cusecs, but still Mysore must pass the same 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs for her power requirements. Thus by agreeing to deduct the quantity diverted at the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to Madras, Madras will not only not lose any water, but will be able to raise if she wishes a small second crop or at least to grow seed beds to start irrigation in time instead of waiting for the first freshes in June to raise seed beds.

Item (*b*).—This may be agreed to. A year's joint gaugings and a daily water card will probably suffice.

2. The Mysore Government's request for a list of irrigation works constructed after the Agreement of 1924 on any of the affluents of the Cauvery or its tributaries is not clear. If any work not permitted by the Agreement had been built, the consent of Mysore would certainly have been obtained as in this case, and also in the case of the Penner-Kumudavathi scheme about which Mysore have been informed according to the 1933 Agreement. The direct reply to Mysore's query is 'Nil'. I recommend (1) that conditions (*a*) and (*b*) above may be agreed to; one great advantage gained is that Mysore may be deemed to have accepted the principle that schemes on sub-tributaries also require the consent of the other Government—please see in this connection paragraph 2 of my No. 1808/36-B-22, dated 19th November 1937, and (2) Mysore also may be requested to furnish to Madras a statement similar to the one referred to in paragraph 3 of the Mysore Secretary's letter.

ENCLOSURES

(1)

From the Paddy Specialist, Coimbatore, dated the 26th March 1933, R.O.C. No. 350/35.

The Superintending Engineer, Coimbatore, put me a straight question whether in practice the transplanted paddy or the broadcast paddy requires more water without any reference to the scheme under contemplation in Kollegal. I had, therefore, to give my opinion for a wet-broadcast crop as compared to a wet-transplanted crop of the same variety.

2. After perusing the connected papers, I am of the same opinion as that held by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. A paddy-crop broadcast dry and reared with the help of the occasional showers for a couple of months (July and August) and treated as a regular wet crop thereafter would require less water than a transplanted crop. The quantity of water utilized for the preparation of the puddle before transplanting which generally varies from 10–25 inches according to the soil and time taken for preparation, will be saved if broadcasting as at present practised is adopted.

3. A quantity of 30–36 inches may be required in either case during the four months of growth under swamp condition (August-September to November-December). In years when the north-east rainfall is inadequate and ill-distributed, the crop is poor, and if the scheme is to assure a distributed supply during these four months it may not be possible to transplant the whole area and only those in advantageous position would get the benefit of the scheme. It therefore seems to be necessary that the present practice of broadcasting dry should, as far as possible, be encouraged.

(2)

From the Superintending Engineer, Coimbatore Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, Madras, dated the 30th April 1938, No. 371-I/441-G.

[*Reference*—Correspondence ending with your Memorandum No. 1808/36-B-26, dated the 3rd March 1938.]

The Executive Engineer, Salem Division, reports that the Collector has since furnished him with a statement from the ayacutdars under the Kottakarai tank to the effect that they agree to grow broadcast paddy only as was being done hitherto in the locality.

Order—No. 2443, dated 17th November 1938.

The Government approve an expenditure of Rs. 12,500 on the construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.

2. The expenditure is debitable to "18—Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from Ordinary Revenues—Irrigation Works—Works for which neither Capital nor Revenue Accounts are kept".

3. The following letter will be sent to the Hon'ble the Resident in Mysore :—

[Letter No. 2444, dated 17th November 1938]

(By order of His Excellency the Governor)

K. RAMUNNI MENON

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Board of Revenue.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

(Irrigation)

No. 2444.

From

K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of Madras,

To

THE HON'BLE THE RESIDENT IN MYSORE,

Dated Fort St. George, the 17th November 1938.

Sir,

[Irrigation—Coimbatore District—Kollegal Taluk—Hebbahalla Scheme—Y
Letter No. R. Dis. F. 330-38/R.O.I., dated 28th September 1938.]

I am directed to say that without accepting any claims or principle for other cases this Government agree to pass down the anicut proposed to be constructed the natural flow in the Hebbahalla during the period 28th January to 27th May (both days inclusive), and to provide sufficient checks to verify the natural flow at the anicut as desired in paragraph 2 of Mysore Government's letter, No. 510/K.S.S. 1325, dated 16th September 1938. It is presumed that a year's joint gaugings and a daily water card will suffice to provide the checks referred to.

2. As regards paragraph 3 of the Mysore Government's letter, I am to say that no works have been constructed by this Government on any of the affluents of the river Cauvery or its tributaries above the Sivasamudram anicut after the Agreement of 1924, and to request that information in regard to similar works constructed by the Mysore Government may kindly be furnished.

3. I am to add that, in view of what has been stated in paragraph 1 above, this Government are proceeding with the work on the Hebbahalla Scheme.

In April 1936. the Collector of Coimbatore reported that irrigation sources in the Kollegal taluk suffered badly in recent years due to failure of seasonal rains, resulting in heavy remissions. He suggested that the proposal abandoned in G.O. No. 559-I., dated 19-2-29 should be reconsidered and worked out in two parts (1) the channel part requiring unskilled labour under special accelerated programme and (2) the anicut and sluice part, requiring skilled labour as a contribution work. In

and indirect charges) has been sent to Government for approval. The works are intended for the following purpose.

Hebbahalla is a jungle stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam Reserve Forest of the Kollegal Taluk Coimbatore District. After a short course in British limits, it runs through Mysore territory for about three miles before joining Hone-Hole which falls into the Cauvery. The proposed anicut across Hebbahalla will divert a portion of the river flow into the following existing tanks:-

(1) Kottakarai (2) Hondrabalu, (3) Doddaranganatham (4) Chikkaranganatham (5) Konganakarai and (6) Mudicondam. This proposal aims at improving the supplies to the existing ayacut under the tanks, and no extension of ayacut is proposed.

charges).

Submitted to Government. Government provided Rs. 12,500/- for the work in the current year's budget (Budget Estimate 1938-39), as a Part II Scheme, under 18 - Irrigation - Other Revenue Expenditure - A: Works Major. Plans and estimate xfor the work sent for approval in my No. 1808/36-B-20 dated 25-10-1937, are now with Government. Please see my Endorsement No. 1808/36-B-37 dated 26-9-38 about anticipated expenditure on the work, in the current year. If Government are unable to authorise the starting of the work sufficiently early, it may not be possible to commit Government to expenditure in the current year Vide para 56 of the Budget Manual, Second Edition, and the work will have to be considered again as Part II Scheme for 1939-40. As this position may occur when it is too late to propose the work as a Part II Scheme for 1939-40, the proposal is now put up as Part II Scheme for 1939-40 for consideration. If Government anticipate any delay in sanctioning the scheme.

for Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

To the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department.

A final proof is herewith for your approval. The corrections have all been carried out. Please see queries within. Ltr 22/11

CONFIDENTIAL NOTES TO G.O. No. 2443 I 17TH NOVEMBER 1938

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NOTES CONNECTED WITH G.O. No. 2443, DATED 17TH NOVEMBER 1938.

[SUBJECT.—*Irrigation—Coimbatore—Kollegal taluk—Hebba Construction of anicut.*]

PART II SCHEME, 1938-39.

From the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) No. 891/37-*D*-22, *dated* 22*nd October* 1937.
From the Chief Engineer (*Irrigation*) *No.* 1808/36-*B*-20, *dated* 25*th October* 1937.

Please see the Chief Engineer's note on page 1 and the Board's endorsements on pages 3-4, current file, which explain the proposals fully. The revenue aspect has been examined by the Board and it has worked out that the combined scheme of the anicut and the supply channel—the latter is being separately excavated under the accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor irrigation works—will pay a return of 5·76 per cent, while the anicut scheme alone will pay a return of 12·5 per cent (according to the Chief Engineer). As the return for productive works has been reduced to 4 per cent with effect from 1st April 1937, even the combined scheme is productive. The proposals may, in the circumstances, be accepted with the concurrence of Revenue and Finance.

2. The Chief Engineer and the Board say that the supply channel will not be of much use without the anicut. It does not however seem to follow that merely because of this fact, the whole scheme should be treated as one for purposes of sanction—vide paragraph 409 of the Public Works Department Code. In any case, as the supply channel work is already in progress and as the estimate has been charged to a different head "68. Irrigation", the matter need not be reopened

D.V.K.—27-10-37. M.S.K.—27-10-37.

Please carry out the corrections & strike off clean copies

Submitted that this department may agree to the proposal being considered as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39.

2. This department may also agree with Public Works Department that this work and the supply channel need not be treated as forming part of one scheme, though for purposes of the return expected, the two have to be considered as one scheme as it is stated that without the proposed anicut the supply channel under execution will not function effectively.

C. A. SUNDARAM AYYAR—10-11-37.

C. E. JONES—10-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

A draft note on the Part II Scheme is submitted. It may be sent to Finance for acceptance before circulation to the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) and the Hon'ble the Prime Minister.

2. The Chief Engineer (Irrigation) has separately suggested that the consent of the Mysore Government should be applied for for the proposed work as it is as a sub-tributary of the Cauvery river. [The Hebbahalla is a tributary of the Hone-Hole, or Swarnavathi, which is a tributary of the Cauvery, and the question whether such consent is or is not necessary under the Mysore-Madras Cauvery Agreement of 1924 is not free from doubt.] The suggestion is being examined in another file.

D.V.K.—26-11-37. M.S.K.—26-11-37.

P. MADHAVA MENON—29-11-37.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—29-11-37.

FINANCE (B.E. II) DEPARTMENT.

(Previous Finance Note on page 1 above.)

Please see paragraph 2 of Public Works Department above. If it is considered necessary to obtain the Mysore Government's consent to the execution of the proposed work, the question arises whether that Government will give their consent readily and whether the Public Works Department will be able, after obtaining the consent, to finish the work next year, i.e., to spend the entire demand of Rs. 12,500. Public Works Department may be requested to consider this point, and if necessary, to reduce the amount of the demand for next year.

The draft Part II Scheme note may otherwise be accepted and the following added as note by this department :—"The proposal may be considered as a Part II Scheme for 193[illegible]"

C.A.S.—30-11-37.

C.E.J.—30-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Please see the notes in the linked file*. Order of the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister and His Excellency may be taken whether the proposal had better be deferred till the consent of Mysore is obtained or whether the proposal may be pushed through as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39 on the assumption that it would be possible to start work before March 1939.

D.V.K.—2-12-37. M.S.K.—2-12-37.

If in the linked file* it is decided to make a reference to Mysore it will perhaps be better if this proposal is held up till we get a reply from Mysore.

P.M.M.—6-12-37.

K.R.M.—6-12-37.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—13-12-37.

This need not be held up and the letter to the Mysore Government should be on the basis of the project going on.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—14-12-37.

Since disposed of in Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

With reference to the orders of the Hon'ble the Prime Minister in this and the linked file*, the Part II Scheme note in this file may issue at once and further action taken thereafter.

D.V.K.—20-12-37. P. MADHAVA MENON—20-12-37.

PART II SCHEME FOR 1938-39

[Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.]

Summary.

Head of account.	Item of expenditure.	Ultimate cost.	Cost in 1938-39.
		RS.	RS.
18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues.	Construction of an anicut with a headsluice across the Hebbahalla river, Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district.	12,500 (Non-recurring).	12,500 (Non-recurring).

NOTE BY THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

The Hebbahalla river is a jungle stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam reserve forests of the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district. After a short course in British limits, it runs through Mysore State for about three miles before joining the Hone Hole or Swarnavathi, a tributary of the Cauvery river.

2. The improvement of the irrigation sources in the Kollegal taluk has been engaging the attention of Government for a long time past and there have been several interpellations in the Legislative Council in the past on this subject. A number of schemes connected with the utilization of the waters of the Hebbahalla were considered between the years 1921—1929. The investigation of a reservoir scheme was commenced in 1924 and plans and estimates amounting to Rs. 2·65 lakhs were prepared in 1928. It was however abandoned in 1929 as it was found to be totally unremunerative. An alternative scheme for diverting the waters of the stream by constructing an anicut across it was prepared and it was estimated to cost Rs. 31,420. This scheme also had to be dropped as it was considered that it would not improve the existing supply.

3. The Chief Engineer for Irrigation has now submitted a modified scheme according to which an anicut with a headsluice will be constructed across the stream (Hebbahalla) and a channel excavated therefrom to augment the supply of water to a series of six tanks (Kottakarai), Hondrabalu, Doddaranganatham, Chickaranganatham, Kongankarai and Mudikondan tanks) and avoid the frequent remission in the areas irrigated by them. The estimate for the excavation of the supply channel and its auxiliary works has been separately sanctioned for Rs. 15,000 and is being carried out under the special accelerated and widespread programme of improvements to minor works in the district.

The cost of the anicut and headsluice amounts to Rs. 12,500 and is chargeable to a different budget head, viz., 18. Irrigation—Other Revenue Expenditure financed from ordinary Revenues. As the proposed scheme of the anicut, headsluice and supply channel will result in the saving of an annual remission of Rs. 1,559, the return will be 5·76 per cent on a total outlay of Rs. 27,500. If the anicut scheme alone is taken into consideration the return will be 12·5 per cent. The scheme is thus remunerative, apart from remedying the longstanding grievance of the ryots in the taluk about the inadequate supply of water for irrigation from the tanks. It is accordingly proposed to include a provision of Rs. 12,500 for the work in the Budget Estimate for 1938-39.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—29-11-37.

NOTE BY THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

The proposal may be considered as a Part II Scheme for 1938-39.

C. E. JONES—30-11-37.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

From the Chief Engineer (Irrigation), No. 1808/36-B-30, dated 26th March 1938.

Please see the letter to the Resident in Mysore No. 652, dated 29th March 1938. Funds have been included for the work in the Budget Estimate for 1938-39. For orders whether a draft order may be put up *now* approving the 'proposal' and the estimate, or

Since disposed of in Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938.

whether this may wait for two or three months to see whether the Mysore Government send any reply. (A copy of the letter to the Resident, dated 29th March 1938 has been sent to the Chief Engineer but the present letter from the Chief Engineer was written before the copy of the letter to the Resident was received by him.)

D.V.K.—2-4-38. M.S.K.—4-4-38. P. MADHAVA MENON—4-4-38.

Put up demi-official to Chief Engineer asking him whether there is any objection to the matter being held over for a couple of months to see if Mysore will have anything to say.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—4-4-38.

Draft demi-official submitted.

D.V.K.—4-4-38. M.S.K.—5-4-38. P.M.M.—5-4-38.
K.R.M.—5-4-38.

(1)

Demi-official from K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 5th April 1938, No. 3525-D/37-3.

[Your letter No. 1808/36-B-30, dated 26th March 1933.]

The Mysore Government have just been addressed in the matter and a copy of the letter (No. 652, dated 29th March 1938) has been sent to you. There is of course no objection to the Superintending Engineer proceeding with the preliminaries as instructed by you, but it is perhaps desirable to wait for a couple of months and see whether Mysore will have anything to say before orders formally sanctioning the proposal are issued. Will you kindly say whether there is any objection to this course of action ?

Demi-official from F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, to K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated 7/11th April 1938, No. 1808/36-B-32.

[*Reference.*—Demi-official letter No. 3525 D/37-3, dated 6th April 1938.]

I see no objection to the course of action indicated, and I have informed the Superintending Engineer accordingly.

Please see the Chief Engineer's demi-official above. No action is necessary now. The file may lie over till 1st August 1938.

D.V.K.—12-4-38. M.S.K.—12-4-38.

Please see notes from pages 3 and 4 for orders whether a reminder may be sent to the Resident in Mysore. The Hon'ble the Prime Minister's notes dated 8th January 1938 and 25th February 1938 on pages 11 and 15 Notes to Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938, indicate that we may await whatever reply Mysore chose to give before actually sanctioning the execution of the work on the construction of the anicut and head-sluice. A draft letter is submitted.

D.V.K.—1-8-38. M.S.K.—1-8-38.

The draft my issue, if considered necessary. It may, however, be inexpedient to do so. It would perhaps be better to construe the silence of the Mysore Darbar as implying consent and to proceed with the works.

K. G. MENON—1-8-38.

The draft may issue.

K.R.M.—2-8-38.

Mysore Government have not chosen to give any reply to our letter and I do not see why we should write to them that we presume they have no remarks to make. The Hon'ble the Prime Minister may again see the file

YAKUB HASAN—3-8-38.

The Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) is right I take it no means that we need not write to the Government of Mysore on the subject now but go on as if they had no objection to make. But there is just one point to remember. We are writing not to the Government of Mysore direct, but to the Hon'ble the Resident. We may without spoiling our case, write to the Resident just asking him whether the subject of our letter of 29th March 1938. was duly intimated to the Government of Mysore. This might help us later on.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—4-8-38.

A confidential demi-official may be written to the Resident presuming that the purport of our letter has been communicated to the Mysore Government and that the latter has not chosen to make any comment on it. The Resident may be taken into our confidence as was done before (*cf.* demi-officials on pages 6-7 Notes to G.O. No. 164 I., dated 15th May 1922, on page 80 Notes to G.O. No. 282 I., dated 21st November 1922, and on page 1 Notes to Letter No. 103 I., dated 4th May 1923), and he may be asked not to press Mysore Government for a reply.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—5-8-38.

I am sorry. I think that it will not be proper or useful to do what is said at B. In fact it may hurt us if we do it. Let the draft as it is, go. As suggested by the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) the letter may be marked Confidential. Perhaps His Excellency had better see.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—9-8-38.

A draft order is submitted.

2. It is, however, respectfully submitted that usually correspondence with Mysore drags on for months and delay in replying to references by either Government (Madras or Mysore) is common as very great care is exercised in examining the proposals owing to the conflict of interests between the two Governments. As regards matters of the kind in question, the following two cases where intimation of the works proposed by Mysore was given to this Government under the Agreement of 1933 will illustrate the delay referred to :—

(1) *Doddamalur tank—Raising capacity—*
Date of first intimation from Mysore, 12th April 1934.
Further particulars asked for by the Government, 5th June 1934.
Reminders on 18th July 1934, 8th November 1934 and 30th January 1935.
Particulars received, 11th March 1935.
Request from this Government to modify proposals, 29th June 1935.
Reminder on 10th October 1935.
Mysore's rejoinder, 24th December 1935.
Madras Government's final reply agreeing to the proposals, 1st September 1936. (Letter No. 2062 I., dated 1st September 1936.)

(2) *mprovements to Koralkunte, etc., tanks—*
Date of first intimation from Mysore, 10th June 1935.
Further particulars asked for by this Government, 12th September 1935.
Reminders on 18th December 1935 and 26th March 1936.
Particulars received from Mysore, 8th May 1936 and 10th June 1936.
This Government's request to modify the proposals, 11th December 1936. (Letter No. 2855 I., dated 11th December 1936.)
Letter from this Government asking whether the modifications were given effect to, 27th April 1937.
Reminder on 18th August 1937.
Rejoinder from Mysore, 26th August 1937.
This Government's reply insisting on the modifications, 15th December 1937.
Reminders on 16th February 1938, 10th June 1938 and 3rd August 1938.
Matter still pending. (C. No. 1246-D/37.)

It will be seen that at every material stage in the correspondence in the above two cases, there was considerable delay on the part of each Government owing to the necessity for carefully scrutinizing the proposals to safeguard its own interests. There is no explicit binding that, under the 1933 Agreement, the Mysore Government should wait until this Government have had their say on the works about which intimation is given by the Mysore Government. Nevertheless, the convention is being gradually established that this Government have a *right* to raise objections—vide in this connection notes at bottom of pages 40, 43–44 and 47 of Letter No. 2855 I., dated 11th December 1936.

It is no doubt true that the Hebbahalla case dealt with in this file has been held not to come under the 1933 Agreement, but on the analogy of the two cases referred to above, it would appear preferable to wait for the Resident's reply before issuing the draft order. Otherwise Mysore may retaliate by not waiting for our objections even in cases coming within the scope of the 1892 and 1933 Agreements, and such a step would be greatly to our detriment. In the Hebbahalla case no harm will be done by waiting for Mysore's consent, and according to the Chief Engineer, they have no reasonable grounds to object. See top of pages 3 and 5 of Letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938.

X

3. Revenue and Legal may see for remarks.

D.V.K.—13-9-38. M.S.K.—13-9-38. K. G. MENON—13-9-38.

A X above : I am not sure. If the channels have been excavated, i.e., if the work has been completed or is expected to be completed soon, we ought to get on with the anicut. If on the other hand it will be a long time before the channels are completed, there can be no harm in postponing the anicut. What exactly is the position regarding the channels ?

K. RAMUNNI MENON—13-9-38.

There is no information as to the progress on the channel excavation work. Presumably it must have been almost completed by now as it was taken up under the special accelerated programme which was closed as such by 31st March 1938, incomplete works being attended to by the regular Public Works Department staff. If definite information is required, the Chief Engineer will have to be asked. Draft telephone message submitted.

NOTES TO G.O. No. 2443 I., 17TH NOVEMBER 1938

Attention is invited to the telephonic message at top of page 5, current file, the Chief Engineer's letter on the same page, and the demi-officials on page 2 ante. It does not appear that the anicut work should be taken up so very urgently as the supply channel will function to some extent even without it.

D.V.K.—13-9-38. M.S.K.—13-9-38. K. G. MENON—14-9-38.

We cannot wait indefinitely for Mysore's letter. Issue the telephone message.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—14-9-38.

[Telephonic message issued on 14th September 1938.]

Endorsement of the Chief Engineer No. 1808/36-B-37, dated 26th September 1938.

From the Secretary to the Resident in Mysore, R. Dis. No. F. 330/38, dated 28th September 1938.

As regards A above, the Chief Engineer reports that the work on the supply channel is nearing completion.

Mysore has replied to our Letter No. 652 I., dated 29th March 1938, regarding the Hebbahalla scheme. The letter from Mysore may be referred to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for very early remarks. Draft Endorsement submitted.

It is also for orders whether sanction to the scheme may be deferred till a decision is reached on Mysore's letter. The file may be circulated to the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) and the Hon'ble the Prime Minister.

May be deferred till Chief Engineer's reply is received.
K.G.M.—29-9-38.

M.S.K.—29-9-38. K.G.M.—29-9-38.

Issue and then resubmit

K.R.M.—30-9-38.

[Issued as Endosement No. 3525 D/37-5, dated 30th September 1938.]

Please see the minutes of the Hon'ble Ministers on page 5 ante. The Resident has now forwarded a copy of the Mysore Government's comments on our proposal (page 4 current file). The remarks of the Chief Engineer have been called for on Mysore Government's letter. Submitted for information.

(Sanction to the scheme may be deferred for the present.)

K.R.M.—1-10-38.
Y[AKUB HASAN]—4-10-38.
C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—5-10-38

From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation No. 1058/38-D-16, dated 28th September 1938.

Please see the Chief Engineer's Endorsements at pages 3 and 4, current file. Obviously, the scheme cannot be formally sanctioned before the end of this month to enable the Chief Engineer to spend the reduced grant of Rs. 2,500 during the current year. It will therefore be necessary to treat the scheme as a Part II Scheme for 1939-40.

Finance may see for remarks.

D.V.K.—10-10-38. M.S.K.—11-10-38. K.G.M.—12-10-38.
K.R.M.—12-10-38.

FINANCE (B.E.-II) DEPARTMENT.

A provision of Rs. 12,500 has been made in the current year's budget for the work "Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore district", the proposal having been treated as a Part II Scheme for the current year. The execution of the work has not yet been taken up and the delay is due to correspondence with the Mysore Government. The Mysore Government have made certain observations on the proposal for the construction of the anicut and these have been referred to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for report. His report is awaited.

The Public Works Department consider that it will not be possible to undertake the execution of the work in the current year. They accordingly propose to consider this scheme again as a Part II Scheme for 1939-40. This is in accordance with the instructions in paragraph 56 of the Budget Manual.

C.A.S.—15-10-38.
C.K.V.—15-10-38.

The proposal of the Public Works Department may be agreed to in this department.

2. It is presumed that it will be possible to come to a definite understanding with the Mysore Government and to undertake and complete the work before the end of 1939-40. If so, provision for the entire cost of the work, viz., Rs. 12,500, may be made in next year's budget.

C.K.V.—15-10-38.

V.G.—14-10-38.

C. A. SUNDARAM AYYAR—15-10-38.

The amount provided in the current year's budget may be surrendered.

C. K. VIJAYARAGHAVAN—15-10-38.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Finance Department's note above and the Chief Engineer's letter at pages current file, since received. As the Chief Engineer says that the conditions imposed by Mysore may be accepted, it seems that the scheme may be sanctioned straight away, and the Mysore Government informed that this Government are proceeding with the scheme and agree to their conditions. If this course is adopted, it will presumably be unnecessary to treat the scheme as a Part II proposal for 1939-40 as some expenditure can be incurred in the current year. In this view, a draft order and a draft letter to the Resident are submitted for approval. The draft letter makes no mention of portion **K** on page 7, current file, as it seems not necessary to do so unless Mysore ask for such a specific assurance.

B

2. With regard to **B** on page 8, current file, attention is invited to Hon'ble the Prime Minister's remarks, dated 8th January 1938 and 25th February 1938, on pages 11 and 15 Notes to Letter No. 652.I., dated 29th March 1938.

3. The file may be sent to Revenue, Legal, and Finance for acceptance of the drafts. They may be requested to treat the case as very urgent.

D.V.K.—20-10-38. M.S.K.—21-10-38.

K. G. MENON—24-10-38.
K. KAMUNNI MENON—24-10-38.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

The previous notes of this department are at page 1 ante. The Part II Scheme note at page 13 ante gives the facts of the case. Please see the notes and the minutes of the Hon'ble Ministers at pages 3-7 ante.

2. The draft order and letter may be accepted and the file passed on to Legal.

M.V.M.—25-10-38. V.N.R.—26-10-38

Attention is also invited to pages 7-8 of Letter No. 652.I., dated 29th March 1938 and pages ~~6 and 7-8~~, current file.

T. M. S. MANI—27-10-38.

I think there is a misconception of the portion marked **K** on page 7, current file, revealed in the Public Works note above. The suggestion of the Chief Engineer which is found at **K** has nothing to do with Mysore asking for a specific assurance. The suggestion (though the Chief Engineer does not state this clearly) is an alternative to acceptance of the Mysore condition that the natural flow be passed down. What in effect the Chief Engineer says is this. We may accept the Mysore condition as the quantity of water to be passed down is likely to be negligible. On the other hand the water so passed down will be wasted. It would really pay us better to suggest that instead of passing down the natural flow we would deduct from the minimum due to us at Sivasamudram, the average annual natural flow during the period 28th January to 27th May. We might then keep the natural flow at our anicut and use it for second crop or seed beds. The Chief Engineer explains that the reduction of our minimum at Sivasamudram would be nominal merely and would not result in any diminution of supply in practice.

This alternative suggestion is worth considering and this Department would recommend that it be followed up.

TH—28-10-38.

NOTES TO G.O. No. 2443 I., 17TH NOVEMBER 1938

LEGAL DEPARTMENT.

The draft letter to the Resident in Mysore is in order.

2. Public Works Department will no doubt consider the suggestion made by the Revenue Secretary in his note ~~above~~ which explains clearly and supports the proposal made in the Chief Engineer's letter to Government.

A on the previous page.

K. V. RAJAGOPALAN—28-10-38.

P. APPU NAIR—28-10-38.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Please see the Revenue Secretary's note on page 8 ante and the Legal Department note (paragraph 2) ~~following it.~~ The Chief Engineer's 'alternative' suggestion was considered carefully before the note on page 8 ante was written. It was thought that it would be inadvisable, and even risky, to go beyond what Mysore themselves ask as conditions for their acceptance of our proposals, and make alternative offers in modification of their conditions, which according to the Chief Engineer are by themselves unobjectionable from the point of view of our interests. The Chief Engineer does not seem to press his 'alternative' suggestion—*cf.* his final recommendation at 'A' on page 8, current file—and in fact his remarks under item (*a*) on page 7 current file seem to be in explanation as to why he thinks we can agree to Mysore's condition to pass down the whole natural flow during the hot weather period. In the circumstances, it seems that no further action is called for on the 'alternative' suggestion—at any rate for the present. This may be adverted to later on if necessary when the anicut is completed and it is found that water is required for second crop or seed beds.

2. Finance have not seen the file. It may be sent to that department before circulation to the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works), the Hon'ble Minister (Revenue), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister, and His Excellency the Governor.

D.V.K.—29-10-38. M.S.K.—29-10-38. K. G. MENON—29-10-38.

The argument in favour of the alternative suggestion is that since Mysore must pass down 1,000—1,200 cusecs in *view of her power requirements* Madras will not lose any water if her minimum demand is fixed at 900 cusecs *minus* a small figure, say 10 cusecs, representing the amount of water diverted by the proposed Hebbahalla anicut. We cannot be too certain that Mysore will always pass down 1,000—1,200 cusecs in view of her power

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

In Letter No. 652, dated 29th March 1938, the Mysore Government were apprised of the intention of this Government to proceed with a scheme for the utilization of the waters of the Hebbahalla river in the Coimbatore district, and it was added that this Government trusted that there was no objection to the work being proceeded with. In reply, the Mysore Government have stated that they would have no objection to the construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river provided that (*a*) the whole natural flow in the river is passed down during the hot weather (28th January to 27th May) and (*b*) sufficient check is afforded to Mysore to verify the natural flow at the site of the proposed anicut. The Chief Engineer, whose remarks were called for, has reported that both the conditions may be agreed to, as there is no flow worth mentioning in the river during the hot weather period, and as the ryots have undertaken to continue to grow as at present the usual dry broadcasted variety of paddy which is sown and reared with the help of occasional showers in July and August and irrigated thereafter till December. With regard to the verification of the natural flow at the site of the proposed anicut, the Chief Engineer presumes that a year's joint gaugings and a daily water card (i.e., a postcard intimation about daily gauge levels) will suffice.

It is accordingly proposed to tell Mysore that the conditions stipulated by them are agreed to and that the work is being proceeded with. Orders will be issued at the same time sanctioning the execution of the work. The draft order and letter placed below are on this basis.

Incidentally, Mysore have asked for information as to the works constructed by this Government on the Cauvery and its tributaries above the Sivasamudram anicut subsequent to the Mysore-Madras Agreement of 1924. The Chief Engineer has stated that there are no such works and has suggested that Mysore should be asked for similar information. The draft letter put up provides for this.

2. The reason adduced by Mysore for the condition imposed by them that the whole of the natural flow should be passed down the Hebbahalla river during the hot weather (28th January to 27th May) is that as the Hebbahalla joins the Cauvery through the Swaranavathi above their Sivasamudram anicut at which point a minimum supply of 900 cusecs is to be guaranteed to Madras during the hot weather period under the 1924 Agreement, any interruption of the flow in the Hebbahalla will reduce pro tanto the total quantity available for being passed down to Madras and will have to be made good by Mysore by increased issue from Krishnarajasagara. In commenting on this the Chief Engineer for Irrigation has stated as follows :—

"I wish to observe that the condition proposed by Mysore is apparently due to an inadequate appreciation of the position. Firstly, the Hebbahalla anicut is 13 miles upstream of the infall of the Swarnavathi into the Cauvery. Hence any small spring flow in summer at the proposed anicut site will be fully absorbed in charging the dry bed of the river and no water will ever reach the Cauvery. No extra issue from Krishnarajasagara will therefore be necessary.

K | Secondly, to save Mysore this extra issue, Madras may say that she agrees to the deduction of this extra quantity from the 900 cusecs due to her at Sivasamudram during the hot weather. By doing so, Madras will not incur any real loss. For example, against 900 cusecs due to Madras, Mysore are now passing 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs in the interest of their own power supply. Assuming that the Hebbahalla anicut diverts 10 cusecs, the quantity due to Madras will be 900—10 or 890 cusecs, but still Mysore must pass the same 1,000 to 1,200 cusecs for her power requirements. Thus by agreeing to deduct the quantity diverted at the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to Madras, Madras will not only not lose any water but will be able to raise if she wishes a small second crop or at least to grow seed beds to start irrigation in time instead of waiting for the first freshes in June to raise seed beds."

The Revenue Secretary thinks that the Chief Engineer's suggestion contained at K above may be considered as an alternative to agreeing to the condition proposed by Mysore as we will not in practice be losing any water below Sivasamudram, and we can utilize the 10 cusecs (the quantity assumed as diverted by the Hebbahalla anicut) for raising a small second crop or for growing seed beds as stated by the Chief Engineer. This department consider it unnecessary to go beyond the conditions proposed by Mysore for the reasons given in the Secretary's note extracted below :—

The argument in favour of the alternative suggestion is that since Mysore must pass down 1,000–1,200 cusecs *in view of her power requirements* Madras will not lose any water if her minimum demand is fixed at 900 cusecs *minus* a small figure say 10 cusecs representing the amount of water diverted by the proposed Hebbahalla anicut. We cannot be too certain that Mysore will always pass down 1,000–1,200 cusecs in view of her power requirements. The Shimsha

project might possibly result in the gradual change over from Sivasamudram to Shimsha (there is a separate file * about this; work on the Shimsha power scheme has already been begun by Mysore) and the position might be reached under which Mysore will not be under the necessity to pass down anything more than the minimum fixed which is at present 900 cusecs. It is undesirable to do anything that might result in Mysore passing down anything less than this at some date in the future."

During my visit to Sivasamudram in May last the local Engineer told me that the new reservoir has been constructed there *with a view to avoid the necessity of passing down more than 900 cusecs.*

Y[AKUB HASAN]—12-11-38.

The Chief Engineer himself has not pressed this alternative suggestion, as his final recommendation is that we may agree to the two conditions proposed by Mysore. The passage in his letter extracted on the previous page appears to be intended to elucidate his point that we need not object to passing down the hot weather flow. No mention is therefore made of this alternative suggestion in the draft letter put up.

3. The draft order, and the draft letter to Mysore which has been scrutinized by the Legal Department, may be submitted to the Hon'ble Ministers (Public Works) and (Revenue), the Hon'ble the Prime Minister, and His Excellency for approval.

D.V.K.—7-11-38. M.S.K—8-11-38. K. G. MENON—8-11-38.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—9-11-38.

Y[AKUB HASAN]—12-11-38

T. P[RAKASAM]—12-11-38

I have added a phrase.

C. R[AJAGOPALACHARIAR]—15-11-38.

E[RSKINE]—16-11-38.

Issue.

The remarks of the Hon'ble Minister (Public Works) are important. They should be extracted and put up in the file * relating to Shimsha.

K.R.M.—17-11-38.

[G.O. No. 2443 I., dated 17th November 1938.]

The draft order and Letter have been issued as Nos. 2443-44 I., dated 17th November 1938.

2. The Shimsha file * has been sent to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation u.o. for remarks on the points raised in the Secretariat note in that file. Extract of the Hon'ble Minister's (Public Works) remarks and Secretary's note above will be placed in that file on return from Chief Engineer for Irrigation. Meanwhile, it seems desirable to inform the Chief Engineer confidentially as to why his 'alternative suggestion' has not been put to Mysore. A draft demi-official is submitted. The demi-official also asks the Chief Engineer to surrender the unspent portion (as far as can be estimated at present) of the budget allotment in the current year for the anicut and headsluice portion of the Hebbahalla scheme—vide paragraph 2 of Finance Department's note on page 9 ante.

This does not appear to be necessary.

K.G.M.—22-11-38.

3. After issue of the demi-official, the file may be sent to Revenue for perusal of the notes from page 9 ante.

D.V.K.—22-11-38. M.S.K.—22-11-38. K.G.M.—22-11-38.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Please see paragraph 3 of the Public Works notes above.

2. The previous notes of this department are at page 8 ante. The notes from page 9 above may be perused, and the file returned to Public Works.

M.V.M.—24-11-38. V.N.R.—25-11-38. T. M. S. MANI—26-11-38.

B. G. HOLDSWORTH—26-11-38.

Since recorded in G.O. No. 1279 I. (Confdl.), dated 23rd May 1939.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Submitted.

2. In view of Under Secretary's marginal remark on the previous page, a draft memorandum to the Chief Engineer regarding surrender of the unspent allotment is put up for approval.

[An explanatory demi-official to the Chief Engineer was put up in regard to his alternative' suggestion because it was thought that the Chief Engineer might know the views of the Government informally on this important matter so as to have a clear understanding between ourselves in our relations with Mysore.]

D.V.K.—29-11-38. M.S.K.—29-11-38. K. G. MENON—29-11-38.

[Memorandum to the Chief Engineer issued as No. 3525-D/37-10, dated 30th November 1938.]

There is no harm in sending the demi-official. It may issue.

K. RAMUNNI MENON—5-12-38.

(2)

Demi-official from K. RAMUNNI MENON, Esq., I.C.S., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to F. M. DOWLEY, Esq., M.I.C.E., Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated the 5th December 1938, No. 3525-D/37-11.

[Hebbahalla scheme—Coimbatore district—Your Letter No. 1808/36-B-38, dated 15th October 1938.]

Orders have been issued in G.O. No. 2443 I., dated 17th November 1938, sanctioning the execution of the scheme, and the Mysore Government have been informed in Letter No. 2444, dated 17th November 1938, that this Government agree to the conditions imposed by Mysore and are proceeding with the work.

2. In your letter quoted above, you suggest that this Government may agree to deduct the extra quantity of water drawn by the Hebbahalla anicut from the 900 cusecs due to them at Sivasamudram during the hot weather, as by doing so, they will not incur any real loss. In view of the Mysore Government's recent activities on the Shimsha Hydro-electric Scheme * there might be a gradual change over from Sivasamudram to Shimsha, and the position might be reached under which Mysore will not be under the necessity to pass down at Sivasamudram anything more than the minimum of 900 cusecs. In fact, during his visit to Sivasamudram in May last, the Hon'ble Minister for Public Works was it is understood informed by the local Mysore Engineer that the reservoir on the Shimsha was being constructed with a view to avoid the necessity of passing down at Sivasamudram more than the 900 cusecs prescribed. You will, in the circumstances, no doubt agree that it is not desirable to adopt your suggestion, and tell Mysore that we are prepared to accept a quantity less than 900 cusecs to be passed down Sivasamudram. No mention has accordingly been made of this in the letter to Mysore.

*Vide papers sent to you with this department U.O. No. 4178-D/38-1, dated 21st October 1938. [Since recorded in G.O. No. 1279 I. (Confdl.), dated 23rd May 1939.]

(1)

Memorandum No.3525 D/37-10, P.W.D., dated 30-11-38.

HEBBAHALLA SCHEME - Coimbatore Dt.

The scheme for the construction of the anicut and head sluice was approved in G.O. No.2443, I, dated 17-11-38. The full amount of the estimate (Rs 12,500) has been provided for in the current year's budget. As however only a small amount is likely to be spent during the year, the Chief Engineer is requested to surrender the balance of the provision not likely to be required.

Part II Scheme for 1938-39

Subject:— Construction of an anicut across the Hebbahalla river in the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore Dt.

mary.

re	Ultimate cost.	Cost in 1938-39
of an	Rs	Rs
the head	12,500	12,500
ross the	(non recurring)	(non recurring)
ha river,		
taluk,		
tore Dt		

Note by the P.W.Dept.

The Hebbahalla river is a single stream having its source in the hills of Arapalayam reserve forests of the Kollegal taluk, Coimbatore Dt. After a short course in Portuguese limits, it runs through Mysore State for about three miles before joining the Honehole or Swarnavathi a tributary of the Cauvery

See also from 744 I/21-3-36 ✓

The Legislative Council in the past in this subject A number of schemes connected with the utilisation the waters of the Hebbatalaba were considered between the years 1921 – 1929. The investigation of a reservoir scheme was commenced in 1924 & plans & estimates amounting to Rs 2.65 Lakhs were prepared in 1928. It was abandoned in 1929 as it was found however ~~found that the scheme~~ to be totally uneconomic An alternative scheme for diverting the waters of the stream by constructing an ancient aeros it was prepared ~~for~~ and it was estimated to cost Rs 31,420. This scheme also had to be dropped as it was considered that it would not improve the existing supply.

p1 Q

p2 Q

p5

~~p6+7~~ IV

The CE(I) has now submitted a modified scheme according to which an ancient with a head sluice will be constructed across the stream (Hebbatalaa) and a channel excavated therefrom to augment the supply of water to a series of six tanks (Kottakarai, Kandrabalu, Doddarangavathan

Chikkarangavatam Kanjana
Karan & Mudicondam tanks)
and avoid the present remission
in the areas irrigated by them
The estimate for the excavation of
the supply channel & its auxiliary
works has been separately sanctioned
for Rs 15,000 and is being carried out
under the special accelerated
widespread programme of works
to prevent unemployment in the district
The Cost of the anicut & head sluice
amounts to Rs 12,500 & is charged
to a different budget head viz,
18 Irrigation — Other Rev Exp financed
from Ordinary revenues — As the proposed
scheme of the anicut, head sluice &
supply channel will result in
the saving of an annual remission of
Rs 1559, the gross return will be
5·76 pc on a total outlay of
Rs 27,500 — If the anicut scheme
alone is taken into consideration
the return will be 12·5 pc. The
scheme is thus remunerative
apart from remedying the long
standing grievance of the ryots in
the taluk about the inadequate

supply of water from Lahan from the tanks. It is accordingly proposed to include a provision of Rs 12,500 for the work in the B.E. for 1938-39

Sd/- Phole
26-11-37 Asst

for
29/11/37

✓ Ky
29/11

Note by the Finance Deptt

The proposal may be considered as a Part II scheme for 1938-39.

C. E. Jones
30.11.37